16/nr

Class 225.951 Book Sa43t
General Theological Seminary Library
Chelsea Square, New York

THE SAMARITANS

THE SAMARITANS

THEIR TESTIMONY TO THE RELIGION OF ISRAEL

Being the Alexander Robertson Lectures, delivered before the University of Glasgow in 1916

BY

REV. J. E. H. THOMSON, D.D.

AUTHOR OF "BOOKS WHICH INFLUENCED THE LORD AND HIS APOSTLES"

OLIVER AND BOYD

EDINBURGH: TWEEDDALE COURT

LONDON: 33 PATERNOSTER ROW, E.C.

1919

225.951
Sa43t

66806

UNION THEOL. SEMINARY
LIBRARY
NEW YORK

TO MY FRIEND

REV. JAMES ROBERTSON, D.D., LL.D.

EMERITUS PROFESSOR OF ORIENTAL LANGUAGES

GLASGOW UNIVERSITY

TO WHOSE SUGGESTION AND ENCOURAGEMENT

MY STUDY OF THIS AND COGNATE

SUBJECTS OWES SO MUCH.

PREFACE

THE present volume contains the substance of a course of lectures delivered in the spring of 1916, before the University of Glasgow, on the Alexander Robertson Foundation. There has been no attempt to retain the lecture form, as much more was required for an adequate discussion of the subject than could be compressed into the compass of six lectures. Besides there were many sides of the questions at issue, which did not lend themselves to treatment in the form of an address. The writer would take the opportunity to thank anew the Divinity Faculty for suggesting to the Senate of Glasgow University his nomination to the above lectureship, and the University Court for his appointment to it. Under the conditions of the lectureship the present work ought to have been published in the spring of the year following; but on economic and other grounds connected with the War, the University kindly permitted delay in the hope that matters would improve. So far, however, from things improving by the signing of the armistice and the practical ending of the War, they have become worse. As the prospect of any improvement in the conditions of book-publication appeared to be rather remote, and for the writer time was passing, it seemed better to risk the disadvantage of issuing a book on a Biblical subject, at a time like the present, when the English-speaking public are obsessed by the Great War and its consequences, than wait any longer.

At the best, even in normal circumstances, a book like the present interests only a very limited public. Not many even among Biblical students, know much about the Samaritans or the relation in which their rites and ceremonies stand to those of the Jews; and of these, very few manifest any wish to increase their knowledge. Conse-

quently it is with considerable diffidence that the writer approaches the public with a treatise on this subject. A little consideration shows that notwithstanding the neglect under which it has suffered, it has an important bearing on questions in regard to the criticism of the Old Testament. The writer's excuse for intervening is that the present work represents the results of independent study pursued somewhat intermittently for nearly thirty years, and in circumstances more favourable to acquiring information than are possessed by many. A somewhat lengthened residence in Palestine, repeated visits to Nablus, and presence at the celebration of the Samaritan Passover, vitalised to the writer ideas derived by him from other sources. Further, personal inspection of a considerable number of Samaritan MSS., including codices of the Torah, was kindly permitted him by the authorities of the British Museum; the Bodleian Library, Oxford; the University Library, and the Libraries of Trinity College and Westminster College, Cambridge. Through the kindness of the custodians of the Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris, he was also enabled to examine the leading codices possessed by them, including that brought to Europe by Pietro della Valle in 1616. One thing which this last privilege revealed to the writer was the very decided difference which subsists between the form of Samaritan characters in type, and those most common in manuscript. The difference of the shape these letters assume in Walton's Polyglot—derived from the Paris Polyglot—from the true form is considerable; out of sight worse, and further from the original is that adopted in Germany from Gesenius downward to Petermann's *Grammar*. In Nicholls' *Grammar* the alphabetic forms are better as nearer Walton's. Confusions of letters easily explicable by the MS. type of character are utterly incomprehensible to one who only knows the conventional form adopted at Gotha and Leipzig.

One unfortunate result of the independent way in which he has carried on his study of this subject is that the writer finds himself, in his conclusions, in opposition on the one side to traditional orthodoxy, and on the other to the still more uncompromising orthodoxy of the dominant critical school. The supercilious contempt with which the latter

regard every opinion that has not been "made in Germany" is scarcely creditable to British scholarship. Especially is this so in regard to the present subject, as most of the recent German writers on Samaritan subjects have been Jews, in whom the passage of twenty centuries and more has not dulled the edge of their animosity, nor lifted at all the veil of their prejudices.

For assistance in correcting proof, the writer would return thanks to the Rev. Dr James Robertson, Professor *emeritus* of Oriental Languages, Glasgow University; Rev. Dr James Kennedy, Librarian, New College, Edinburgh; Dr John Hutchison, Rector *emeritus*, Glasgow High School; Rev. Dr Charles Jerdan, Greenock, Senior Clerk, U.F.C. General Assembly. He has further to thank the Rev. W. B. R. Wilson, Dollar, for compiling an index, and E. Russell, Esq., for general suggestions. The writer would also acknowledge the kindness of Professor W. B. Stevenson in bringing to his notice not a few facts and authorities, which might otherwise have escaped him; to Professor A. R. S. Kennedy for assistance in books; and to Dr Cowley, Oxford, for kind answers to inquiries in regard to matters, authoritative information on which was not open to the writer. He would express his gratitude to Dr Rendel Harris and to his friend the Rev. J. C. Nicol, M.A., Eccles, for information as to the Samaritan codices in the Rylands Library, Manchester. The kindness of the librarians of the Universities of Glasgow and Edinburgh, and of New College, Edinburgh, must not be forgotten. Above all he would tender his thanks to his wife for her assistance in preparing the manuscript for the Press.

In regard to books, the writer would acknowledge his indebtedness to Dr Montgomery's *Samaritans*, especially to the copious list of literature appended; to various articles of Dr Cowley, and to Dr Mill's *Modern Samaritans*.

In transliterating Hebrew words, Dr Davidson (Hebrew Grammar) has been followed, with this exception that *tz* is used for צ *tzade* instead of ç.

CONTENTS

CHAP.		PAGE.
I.	THE HOME AND THE PEOPLE	1
II.	THE HISTORY OF THE SAMARITANS	25
III.	MOSAISM IN NORTHERN ISRAEL	57
IV.	PROPHETISM IN NORTHERN ISRAEL	83
V.	THE RITUAL OF SAMARITAN WORSHIP	115
VI.	SAMARITAN VIEW OF SACRED HISTORY	143
VII.	THE THEOLOGY OF THE SAMARITANS	173
VIII.	THE EVOLUTION OF THE SAMARITAN SCRIPT	203
IX.	THE LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE OF THE SAMARITANS	236
X.	COMPARISON OF THE SAMARITAN PENTATEUCH WITH THE MASSORETIC	275
XI.	THE RELATION OF THE SAMARITAN RECENSION OF THE PENTATEUCH TO THE SEPTUAGINT	319
XII.	THE BEARING OF THE FOREGOING ARGUMENT ON PENTATEUCHAL CRITICISM	352

APPENDICES :—

Catalogue of Manuscripts (Codices), complete and fairly complete, of the Samaritan Torah in Europe and America	387
Description of the Nablus Roll	396
The Relation of the Minoan Alphabet to the Semitic	404
Naville's Theory of the Original Language of the Old Testament	412

INDEX 425

THE SAMARITANS: THEIR TESTIMONY TO THE RELIGION OF ISRAEL

CHAPTER I

THE HOME AND THE PEOPLE

THE testimony of any person or persons as to the social habits of any nation, still more as to their religious observances, will be valuable in so far as it can be shown that by their prolonged residence in the country of that people they are in a position to possess first-hand knowledge. As, however, it is in regard to religion that men are most reticent, even residence in a country would not be enough to guarantee adequate knowledge. If proof were given of participation in the same religious rites as those of the people in question, that would be a warrant for further confidence. In primitive days, religion was connected with race; the religious observances even of one family differed from those of another, and the ritual of each was carefully concealed from all others. To prove that those on whose testimony reliance is placed are of the same race and practised the same rites as those concerning which information is desired, is to make assurance doubly sure. Hence in the present chapter we shall consider first the home of the Samaritans, whose testimony to the religion of Israel we would evoke, and next the race to which they belonged. There is this additional suitability in the above order that unlike most peoples whose country is generally named from them, as England the land of the English, the Samaritans are named from their country; they are the people of Samaria. Their religious rites and observances they claim to be theirs in virtue of their race.

The Home of the Samaritans.

As the Samaritans claim to be descended from the tribes that followed Ephraim when they rebelled against the rule of the Davidic family, the whole of the territory of these Northern tribes has to be regarded as their home. The name Samaria, however, was first applied only to the city erected by Omri for the capital of his kingdom. According to the Scripture narrative (1 Kings xvi. 24) the city was named after the original owner of the hill on which it was built; as his name was Shemer, it was called Shomeron, or probably originally Shamrain (Burney, *Kings*, 204); this, hellenised, became Samaria. Its situation on the top of a bold headland is at once one of great beauty, and what was of greater importance in the capital of a kingdom, of great military strength as against the primitive artillery of the ninth century B.C. The military wisdom of the choice was proved by the fact that though several times besieged by the Syrians it was never captured by them, and by the further fact that only after it was besieged three years did it surrender to Sargon. With its special advantages it is not to be wondered at that it remained the capital of the Northern Kingdom even after the dynasty of its founder had been overthrown. In course of time the name was extended to the whole territory of which it was the capital. This is specially the usage of the prophets. In a similar way, Babylon (Babel) is not always the city, it is occasionally the province, *e.g.*, Dan. iii. 1. Samaria in this wider sense, as including the whole territory of the Northern tribes, extended from the slopes of Hermon and the Lebanon on the north, the transjordanic lands of Reuben, Gad, and the half tribe of Manasseh on the east, and south to a line that appears to have varied, passing slightly south of Bethel, the boundary of the kingdom of Judah. It may be doubted whether, even in the palmy days of Jeroboam II., the territory embraced "the entering in of Hamath," the ambitious limit of the land claimed by Solomon (1 Kings viii. 65).

The provinces east of Jordan were held by a very uncertain tenure. The Stone of Mesha of Moab tells of the

claims he made on the territories of Reuben and Gad; and the narratives in Kings relating the contests concerning the possession of Ramoth-Gilead which Israel had to maintain against the Aramæan kingdom in Damascus show how precarious a hold the King of Israel had on what was beyond Jordan. The fact that even after Ahab had inflicted on Benhadad of Damascus more than one crushing defeat (1 Kings xx.) Ramoth-Gilead is still in the hands of Syria, implies that Bashan, which lay north of it and nearer Damascus, also was left in the possession of Syria. Although Elijah is a Gileadite yet his activity is mainly restricted to the west of Jordan. The kingdom of Jeroboam II. may have included the east of Jordan; but if so his successors soon lost it. The advance of Assyria tended to cut short the coasts of Israel. The Ninevite Empire appears to have absorbed Bashan, Gilead, and the rest of the eastern territories in the reign of Tiglath Pileser (1 Chr. v. 26).

The northern province of Galilee, physically resembling the east of Jordan in the fact that it is intersected with numerous ravines, very deep and precipitous, was like it frequently assailed by invaders. The Aramæans of Damascus did not attempt so much to hold it in permanent possession as they did Gilead, but they seem to have made frequent raids. In the troublous times which succeeded the death of Jeroboam II., Tiglath-Pileser first reduced the Israelites to the condition of tributaries, and then carried away all the principal inhabitants of the northern portions of Galilee, Abel-Maacah, Ijon, Hazor, and the rest. It is to be presumed that inhabitants from other portions of the Assyrian Empire were brought partly to fill up the blank left by the removal of so many of the inhabitants and loss of others by the ravages of war, and partly to act as a garrison against those who were left in the land. Although the deportation of inhabitants only from the northern portion of Galilee is recorded, it would seem that at this time the whole province of Galilee passed from under the rule of the monarchs of Samaria.

To the south was Judah, which had never been under the rule of the kings of Samaria. As has been said, the boundary between these two kingdoms, Ephraim and Judah,

was somewhat indefinite as to the precise line, but the difference in the characteristics of the two territories is marked to the traveller. Judah is in the main a mass of round, barren, stony hills. Though without the frequent and marked wadies which characterise Galilee, still there are some; and the deepest of these go down towards the Salt Sea. It is mainly pastoral, though even for sheep and goats at the present time the pasturage is by no means rich or abundant. The early notes of its history all impress on the reader that the "hill country of Judea" was for the pasturing of sheep. David was a shepherd; his quarrel with Nabal took place when that worthy was shearing sheep; and Absalom invites his father and brothers to his sheep-shearing, when he has determined to take vengeance on Amnon. At a far later date there were shepherds watching by their flocks at night.

In course of time, the name Samaria became restricted to the portion of Palestine between the plain of Esdraelon and the land of Judah. Politically it appears to have formed a separate province under the kings of Assyria. When Sargon, who succeeded Shalmaneser, finished the siege which his predecessor had begun, he set a governor over the land; there is at least a possibility that Hezekiah was the unnamed viceroy. At first like Ahaz his father he was the faithful vassal of Assyria. The summons he sends to all Israel to come to the Passover implies the existence of no authority that could interfere; therefore it would seem that Hoshea had already been deposed and Samaria taken.

The contrast between the middle province and those to the north and south is very marked. From the sea, across the plain of Sharon, the hills of Samaria rise terrace upon terrace till they culminate in the twin heights of Ebal and Gerizim. The aspect of this western front is like that of Palestinian hillsides generally, somewhat sterile, but within this girdle of hills it is very different. To the traveller riding through the district of Samaria, following most likely a bridle-path along the front of low hills, there open out at every turn views or glimpses of rich holms that only need cultivation to laugh with abundant crops. Even as it is, with all the misgovernment of the Turk, villages are frequent,

surrounded by cultivated fields and orchards of almond, citron, and orange trees. Besides, there is in every fold of the hillside the ubiquitous olive. A feature of the province is the number of small plains that are shallow lakes in January, in February dry up, and in May are bearing crops. There is to the east the wide plain of Mokhna and to the west down to the sea that of Sharon. In regard to the latter, it is doubtful to what extent the seacoast was assigned to Ephraim. Even in the days of the dynasty of Omri which, judged by the statements of Mesha, on his *stela*, was very powerful, the Philistines possessed the plain, for to appeal to the God of Ekron is to pass beyond Israel (2 Kings i. 6). It is in Ezion-geber on the Red Sea that Ahaziah joins with Jehoshaphat in building ships, not at Joppa or Akka on the Mediterranean (1 Kings xxii. 48; 2 Chron. xx. 36). The characteristics of the province itself which strike the traveller as in contrast with those of the south and the north, are the want of the rolling sterile hills of Judea, and of the frequent, deep, and precipitous gorges of Galilee; it is, in the language of Isaiah, full of "fat valleys" with numerous vineyards and many winefats.

Not only was the central portion of Palestine the most beautiful and most fertile, it had much, perhaps most of historic interest attaching to it. Especially was this the case in regard to the central valley of Shechem in which the remnant of the nation is still to be found. In Shechem it was that Abraham first encamped, and there was he privileged to receive his first revelation of God. His next place of encampment was still within the central province; he placed his tent on "a mountain between Bethel and Hai" (Gen. xii. 8). When Jacob came back to Canaan from Padan-Aram, he purchased "a parcel of a field from the children of Hamor where he had spread his tent" (Gen. xxxiii. 19). There too, Joshua, when he was old, called together all the elders of Israel, their heads and their judges to present themselves before God to renew their covenant with the Lord (Josh. xxiv. 1). There at an earlier period had Joshua fulfilled the command of Moses, and had built on Mount Ebal an altar to the Lord, and "wrote there a copy of the law of Moses, in the presence of the children of

Israel." There, too, he placed the elders of one half of the tribes of Israel on the slope of Mount Gerizim, and the other half on the slope of Mount Ebal, the one to recite the blessings, the other the curses written in Deuteronomy. At the mouth of the valley where it opens out into the plain of Mokhna is, according to a well-supported tradition, the tomb of Joseph. In the valley itself occurred the bloody episode of the slaughter of the sons of Gideon. From the slope of Gerizim, Jotham declaimed his parable. Here, too, in Shechem it was that Rehoboam met the tribes of Israel, and by his insolence lost the kingdom to the House of David. In this province, to the south-west, is Timnath-Serah where Joshua was buried. To the north in the territory of Manasseh is Ophrah of the Abiezrites, where was the threshing-floor of Gideon. In Mount Ephraim "between Ramah and Bethel" rose the palm-tree under which Deborah sat and judged Israel. Toward the south of Mount Ephraim was the Ramah where Samuel was born, and where in after years he dwelt. Nearly within sight of the valley of Shechem was Shiloh, where so long stood the central shrine of the Holy People, in which Eli ministered.

To one looking from the mountains of Galilee across the plain of Esdraelon, the two mountains Ebal and Gerizim stand out prominent, and form the centre of the view which has Tabor Carmel and Gilboa for a foreground. Ebal, although the nearer and the higher, does not quite hide Gerizim from view. These peaks have equal prominence from the east of Jordan. It is no wonder that Moses singled out these mountains as those on which the law was to be engraved and on which the altar was to be built. It is no wonder that he selected the valley between these mountains as the place where the tribes were to recite the solemn curses and blessings. These mountains were in the very centre of the Promised Land; what place more suitable could be found in which Israel should renew their covenant with JHWH? If Deuteronomy was forged, the forger must have been endowed with a transcendent dramatic instinct to enable him to view the Land of Promise from a point, physical and moral, which would appeal to the Hebrew Lawgiver, looking at it from the east of Jordan, however

little it might appeal to a Jew of Jerusalem. This is all the more remarkable that not till long afterwards was the artistic necessity of local colour recognised in literature. Shakespeare makes Hector quote Aristotle, and gives Bohemia a seacoast. It is difficult to imagine a Jerusalem Jew of the seventh century B.C. able to place himself so completely in the position of Moses.

Such was the home of the Samaritan people when it was flourishing, such their home when the name Samaria was restricted to the middle province of Palestine. Now it is further restricted. Little more than a century ago the Samaritan nation had several communities in Egypt and Syria, but now only in the valley of Shechem—only in a small quarter of the city of Nablus are any Samaritans to be found. It is true the valley of Shechem was the very heart of Samaria, indeed of the whole land of Israel. Extremity after extremity has been lopped off, only in a single valve of the heart the life's blood remains.

The valley of Nablus is one of the most beautiful places in Palestine. It runs nearly east and west, strictly speaking from nearly south-east to nearly north-west, between Ebal on the north and Gerizim on the south. To the traveller coming from the north, after he has passed Sebastiyeh on his right hand, there opens shortly to his left the broad glen of Shechem. It is a sea of verdure, not the pale verdure of the grass of the field, but the full rich green of the fig-tree and the pomegranate. It consists of numerous orchards and gardens, overshadowed with fruit-trees—citrons, oranges, and apricots. According to the season the traveller, as he passes along, sees peeping out from its dark green polished leaves the bright insistent red of the pomegranate flower, or earlier the white blossoms of the almond. The green of the mass of verdure is carried up the slopes of the mountains that bound the valley, by olive-yards and vineyards. Mainly on the slopes of Mount Gerizim is this seen, though Mount Ebal is not so sterile as some have imagined it to be. Above the belt of olives and vines rise the twin mountains, the highest in Central Palestine. If the traveller withdraws his eyes from the heights, and gazes along the tops of those green fruit-trees, he will note the minarets of the five mosques

of the city, rising white out of the mass of dark greenery. Four of these mosques were originally Christian churches; one is claimed by the Samaritans as having been their principal synagogue. To one approaching Nablus from the south the view is somewhat different. The track leads round the base of Mount Gerizim to the left, and leaves Joseph's tomb and Jacob's well to the right; it then passes westward through a mile or two of broad fertile fields. In front rise the green orchards, from which spring the minarets before spoken of. Nearer the city are heaps of ashes, the refuse of soap manufacture, the principal industry of the place. This valley owes its fertility and beauty to the moisture of the winter snows and rains which, stored up in the bosom of the two guardian mountains, is shed forth in springs and streams that flow out unstinted during the drought of the hottest summer. Heat and moisture are the twin sources of fertility.

The modern city of Nablus is one of the most important in Palestine; its population is probably from twenty to twenty-five thousand. Like most Eastern cities there is a broad street, called the *Suq* or market, which traverses the city from east to west. The greater portion of this is vaulted, and is lighted by openings in the roof which are glazed. The length of the city is estimated by Guerin to be about three-quarters of a mile; its breadth he reckons to be rather less than a third of a mile at its broadest. It is divided into quarters, as are so many cities in the East. These are traversed by streets leading off the Suq, which are narrow and crooked, full of dust and garbage in summer, and mud and garbage in winter. The largest of these quarters is the Hâret Jasmineh. It is close beside the foot of Mount Gerizim, and the traveller, entering Nablus from the north, comes into it first. A lane leaves the Suq to the right and leads up to the Hâret es Samireh—the Samaritan quarter. It is not strictly speaking a quarter of the city, it is too small; it is merely a group of mean houses that cluster about the small dark synagogue, the last remaining shrine of the sons of Ephraim. This group of houses is the Ghetto of the small remnant of the Ten Tribes.

From this quarter a bridle-path leads up to the top of

Mount Gerizim. Very soon the path has crossed the belt of orchards and vineyards, and thereafter it skirts them for about two hours, riding at muleteer's pace. When the vineyards are left the pathway becomes more rocky and the hillside is bare, covered only with grass and a few small bushes. A short pull brings the rider and his steed to the top of the mountain. The pathway ends at one of the higher portions of the plateau that forms the top of the mountain. From there it dips down to where there appear the green mounds that mark the ruins of ancient buildings. Most of the ruins in Palestine, at least of any antiquity, except on the seacoast, are represented by green mounds; perhaps the friable nature of the stone of which they have been built explains this. At the opposite end of the platform, toward the south-east, the ground rises again; on the highest point of this there is erected a *wely*, the tomb of a Mohammedan saint, Sheikh Ghanem. Like other buildings of this class it is domed and white. It overlooks the plain of Mokhna; visitors are recommended to view the plain from its window.

The slight depression in this platform represents the home of the Samaritan religion. Those green mounds, from which here and there appear traces of carved stones, the Samaritans claim to be the remains of their ancient temple. This claim can only be admitted with modifications. There have been numerous successive buildings erected one on the top of the other. There might be an ancient Canaanite High Place here. It is not improbable, although there appears no notice of it in Scripture, that an Israelite High Place would replace that of the Canaanites. Superimposed upon these in all likelihood was the temple erected by Sanballat. It was destroyed by John Hyrcanus (120 B.C.) and its rubbish added to the general heap. As the language of the Samaritan woman in her conversation with our Lord seems to imply that worship was at that time carried on in the sacred mountain, it is not improbable that Herod rebuilt the temple for the Samaritans when they were put under his rule. It may certainly be regarded as against this, that Josephus, when he relates the slaughter inflicted by Cerealis on the Samaritans, does not say

anything of edifices having been destroyed by him. The Samaritans themselves credit Adrinus (Hadrian) with the destruction of their temple. He erected a temple to Jupiter on Mount Gerizim, as in Jerusalem he erected a temple to Venus. A coin of the period of the Antonines, struck in Flavia Neapolis (Nablus), represents on the reverse a temple with pillared portico on Mount Gerizim; a stairway is shown going from the foot of the mountain to the top. A century later a coin of Volusianus shows the same design. It has been assumed that this was a heathen temple, but according to Josephus the temple in Jerusalem, as rebuilt by Herod, had porticos with pillars; if one may judge by other Herodian remains these pillars would be after Roman models. It might quite well be that Hadrian repaired the Herodian temple on Mount Gerizim and rededicated it to Jupiter.

Dr William Thomson in *The Land and the Book* gives a plan of the ruins to be traced on the top of Gerizim, copied from that in the *Pal. Explor. Quart. Statement*, 1873, p. 66, the work of Sir Charles Warren: in a subsequent page there is a view of some of the structures. Guerin (*Description de la Palestine: Samarie*, xxv., pp. 424-445) has a careful description, accompanied by measurements, of the structures as he saw them in 1870. The most striking is the platform composed of large blocks of stone, called from their number *thenasher bâlata*, "the twelve stones." At first sight they appear to be native rock, part of the mountain; but half a century ago Lieutenant Anderson proved by excavation that they were not part of the rock but had been placed in their present position. They are huge undressed blocks of limestone. The Samaritans assert that these were the twelve stones which Joshua commanded the children of Israel to take up out of the midst of Jordan and carry to the place where they lodged. The probability is that these stones were originally laid there to form a platform for the altar which preceded the erection of the temple by Sanballat. These stones were twelve "according to the number of the tribes of Israel." Then tradition took the matter in hand and identified them with the stones taken out of Jordan. It is to be noted that there is evidence here that the

Samaritans knew something of the contents of the book of Joshua. This platform, according to Sir Charles Warren's plan, is to the west of the mountain.

Immediately to the east is a ruined structure which Guerin calls *qalah*, "the castle." It is a large four-sided enclosure of 79 metres by 64½ metres (86½ yards by 70), thus approximately a square. At each of the corners there are the remains of four square towers with one in the middle of the south wall. Sir Charles Warren's plan is presumably drawn accurately to scale. According to it the size of this structure differs considerably from the measurements of M. Guerin. Warren's figures are 200 feet by 150, that is to say, 67 yards by 50, so very much smaller. Round this platform, between the towers, Warren notes that he observed the remains of chambers. This may have marked off the *harâm* area of the Samaritan temple. It is, however, so much smaller than that at Jerusalem that one hesitates to affirm this confidently. In the centre of this enclosure there is figured by Sir Charles Warren the plan of an octagonal structure. This is described by M. Guerin. The walls are only to be traced by the irregularities of the ground. It has been built, he says, of cut stones regularly and throughout polished. It was doubtless covered over by a dome. There had been an apse to the east, and five side chapels, one directly south, the rest in the intermediate directions S.W., N.W., N.E., and S.E. The doorway was to the south. According to Warren's plan there were eight pillars supporting the dome. The diameter of this structure within, if the chapels and the apse be neglected is, according to Guerin, 23 metres (25¼ yards), and each side of the polygon, 9 metres (11 yards). In this case Sir Charles Warren's figures agree with those of M. Guerin. When, however, Guerin says the depth of the recess of the apse is equal to the length of one of the sides of the polygon, the difference between the authorities is considerable; instead of the 9 metres of Guerin, Warren has 20 feet, little more than 6 metres. The measures given in the Memoirs do not quite accord with either. Procopius describes a church erected by the Emperor Zeno on Mount Gerizim, and dedicated to the Virgin Mary, which seems to agree with this. M. Guerin

deduces that the structure which rose upon this plan had a domed roof, a deduction that is confirmed by Sir Charles Warren's plan which, as we have said above, shows eight pillars. There is an obvious resemblance in this on the one side to the Mosque of Omar, the Qubbet es-Sakhra, and on the other to Saint Sophia. In Sir Charles Warren's article it is said that the floor had been partly of marble and partly of tiles. As we have indicated, there is a tendency to regard it as certain, that this church was erected on the site of the Samaritan temple. This, however, is not the Samaritan tradition. About 240 feet distant from the enclosure surrounding the Church of Zeno, according to the map of the Palestine Exploration Fund, is a site much more sacred to the Samaritans. It is like the rock that is seen in the Mosque of Omar, a platform of native rock of irregular shape and surface; at its southern end is a depression, presumably for the reception of the blood of sacrificial victims. This may have been an altar in Canaanite times, and the human bones found in the pit near at hand may have been those of human victims. The Samaritan tradition is that it was over this rock that their temple was built. This Sakhra or Holy Stone is the place, of all the sites on this sacred hill, which is most sacred; no member of the Samaritan community approaches it but barefoot. It would be loss of time to describe the stone on which Abraham was about to sacrifice Isaac, and the Seven Steps by which Adam descended when he was driven out of Paradise; for here, according to Samaritan tradition, was the Garden of Eden.

Quite to the west of these structures is the portion of the sacred plateau which the Samaritans have purchased for the celebration of their Passover. They had been excluded from the top of Mount Gerizim for about forty years by the Turks, but through the intervention of the British Consul the right of visiting the sacred sites was restored to them. It ought to be noted that M. Guerin credits Louis Philippe with this interference on behalf of the Samaritans. Dr Montgomery (*Samaritans*, p. 141), gives a very different account of the relation of the Orleanist sovereign to the persecuted remnant in Nablus. They appealed to him, but their appeal for State

reasons remained unanswered. They were at all events, by whose influence so ever, allowed to purchase a portion of the top of the sacred hill, in order to consecrate it for the Passover celebration. In this plot they dug a trench and a pit which they lined with stones, so that, though filled up in the interval between the periods of observance, they could easily be re-opened. In a communication to the *Palestine Exploration Quarterly* (1903 p. 91) the Rev. Roland G. Stafford gives an account of the Passover observances dictated in Arabic by the Samaritan High Priest, which includes a rough diagram. There is in it no attempt at drawing to scale, or even at approximation to accuracy in the representation of the topographical relation of the sites. The pit is represented by a square, in which is inserted the statement that this "furnace" was "taken from the time of Abraham" (Gen. xv. 17); in other words this pit was "the smoking furnace and burning lamp" which Abraham saw when God made a covenant with him after the slaughter of the kings. It is not of importance to Samaritan tradition that this was a vision furnace, or that the vision in which it was seen occurred in Hebron.

No description of the home of the Samaritans would be complete without some account of the characteristics and appearance of Mount Ebal. It rises to the north of the valley of Nablus and attains a height of over 3000 feet. It is rather more rugged and difficult of ascent than is Mount Gerizim. Although the vineyards and olive-yards do not rise up the side of Mount Ebal so high as they do up the side of Mount Gerizim, still Ebal is not the desolate mountain, in comparison with Gerizim, that it has pleased the imagination of some travellers to describe it. Certainly the rocks are more in evidence, and riding up is more precarious on account of the liability of the horses to slip on the flat exposed surfaces of limestone. There are traces that in earlier days cultivation by terraces was carried up much higher. When the top is reached there are remains of pretty extensive ruins, evidently supposed by native tradition to be those of a fortress, as they are called *qalah*, "the castle." Guerin describes this structure as built of blocks of stone, very roughly cut; he gives the measurements of the irregular square as thirty-two paces a side; this,

reckoning a pace at $2\frac{1}{2}$ feet, would make the size about 80 feet square. Near by are other ruins supposed, at least by the natives, to be those of a church, as they call the heap *khurbet keneiseh*, "ruined church." The view from the top is superb. Away to the north rises to the right, the great mass of Hermon which even in midsummer justifies the name by which it is sometimes called, *Jebel et-Telj*, "the Mountain of Snow"; to the left, peering over the nearer peaks of the Lebanon, overlooking the sea, is visible the white top of Jebel Sannin. To the west is the plain of Sharon, and beyond it the Great Sea of the Hebrews sparkles in the sunlight. Away over Jordan rising above the rest of the mountains of Gilead is Jebel Osha, which some regard as the true Nebo from which Moses saw the Promised Land, and south over the Dead Sea are seen the mountains of Moab; while nearer hand the towers are visible that crown Mount Olivet.

Such then is the home of the Samaritans that survive from the Ten Tribes, despite the persecutions they have endured at the hands of every power which has borne rule over Palestine. Here have they dwelt alongside of the Jews, according to their own account since Joshua conquered the land; even on the Jewish account, since some seven centuries before Christ. Parallel with them they have obeyed the same law, observed the same customs, and celebrated the same festivals. As credible witnesses of the nature of the religion of the Jews they have every local advantage.

The Samaritan People.

As we have already seen, that while local identity is an important element in regard to testimony as to religion, identity of race is yet more important. The Samaritans themselves claim to be, like the Jews, the descendants of Abraham and of Jacob. The Jews, in this followed by the Christians, regard the tribes which inhabited the north of Palestine as having been deported totally, and therefore to be sought anywhere but in the land given to their fathers. Few things have more occupied the imaginations of those peoples who possess the Scriptures of the Old Testament, whether Jews or Christians, than the fate of what are called

"The Lost Ten Tribes." In the most diverse quarters have they been discovered. The Talmudic accounts are vague geographically; somewhere away to the east is all that is asserted. Very different in this respect are the views of the Christians who have occupied themselves with this question. Some find them in the Jews who are resident in China. Others think the Afghans to be the true descendants of the ten lost tribes. Not a few have been ready to recognise them in the much persecuted Nestorians of Mesopotamia. Most extraordinary of all is the notion that these lost tribes have reappeared in the Anglo-Saxon race. On views like these, of course the claims of the modern Samaritans to Israelite descent are not worthy of a moment's consideration. These ideas are derived from the seventeenth chapter of 2nd Kings, and in accordance with it, the Samaritans are regarded as the offspring of the mixed multitude of heathens, the colonists who, sent by the Assyrian monarchs, assumed, from the fear of lions, a certain reverence for JHWH, but at the same time continued the worship of their own gods. This is the view of the Jews of the present day. Earlier also in the Talmud the Samaritans are always spoken of as כּוּתִים "Cuthæans," since Cuthah was one of the places from which the colonists had been brought by the Assyrians.

It cannot be denied that at first sight the statements in 2 Kings xvii. seem to warrant this interpretation, but closer study of the narrative leads to the conclusion that certain modifications of the common view are needful. The common view implies that the whole population was removed, but in the narrative the statement is general and to be regarded as more sweeping than accurate. If all the prominent people—all that meant the nation in the eyes of the people of Israel themselves or in the eyes of neighbouring nations—were deported, that would satisfy the representations of the book of Kings. It is to be noted that the repeated statement that JHWH "removed Israel out of His sight" points rather to the deprivation of spiritual privileges than to physical removal to another land. It is certainly said that "Israel was carried away out of their own land"; but it is not said that *all* Israel was so deported: the removal, as we have said, of all the prominent persons, the heads of families,

the priests, the prophets, would satisfy this statement. On the other hand when Hezekiah celebrated his great Passover (2 Chron. xxx. 1 ff.) he "wrote letters also to Ephraim and Manasseh that they should come to the House of the Lord at Jerusalem," a fact to which we have already adverted in another connection. He further made a proclamation "throughout all Israel from Beersheba even unto Dan that they should come to keep the Passover . . . saying, 'Ye children of Israel, turn again unto the Lord God of Abraham, Isaac, and Israel, and He will return to the remnant of you that have escaped from the hand of the kings of Assyria.'" What was the date of this Passover? At first sight it would seem to be in the first year of Hezekiah's reign in Jerusalem. But by careful comparison of dates it would appear that his reign is computed according to two different reckonings. Parallel with this is the fact that while Sargon appointed a deputy over the kingdom of Israel, the name of the deputy is not given in Sargon's inscription. If Hezekiah were this deputy, then the apparent confusion of regnal years would be explained, and also the tone which he employs in writing to the inhabitants of the Israelite territory "from Beersheba even unto Dan." Hezekiah reckoned occasionally the years of his reign from his entrance upon his rule over all Israel.[1] It was quite natural that he should solemnise his accession to a new dignity by celebrating a Passover to which all Israel were summoned. Thus this Passover is to be dated in the sixth or seventh year of his reign in Jerusalem. It is clear from this summons that the "remnant that had escaped from the hands of the King of Assyria" was very considerable. In the account of the Passover kept by Josiah, more than three-quarters of a century later, given in 2 Chron. xxxv. 17, it is said, "The children of Israel that were present (marg. "found," *han-nimtza'im*) kept the Passover at that time"; in the next verse the Chronicler speaks of "all Judah and Israel that were present"—a phrase which shows that he had the distinction between Judah and Israel before his mind. In perfect accordance with this is the testimony of Josephus

[1] The writer would acknowledge his indebtedness to Rev. R. B. Pattie, B.D., Glasgow, for the explanation here given of the apparent discrepancies of the chronological notes of Hezekiah's reign.

(*Ant.* X. iv. 5): "After these things Josiah went also to all the Israelites who had escaped captivity and slavery under the Assyrians, and persuaded them to desist from their impious practices." From his statements elsewhere it is clear that Josephus would be under no temptation to justify the claims of the Samaritans to Israelite descent; hence his admission in this instance of the existence of a considerable Israelite remnant is of all the greater value.

Further, when we consider the object the Assyrians had in view in these deportations, the total removal of the people of one province to another becomes the more unlikely. Their object was to prevent rebellion against their rule on the part of any of the conquered peoples that manifested a tendency to revolt. To deport totally the population of one region to another, would not necessarily lessen the probability of rebellion to any serious extent; it would merely change its geographical theatre. Moreover when the methods of Nebuchadnezzar are considered (and his empire was in all essentials a continuation of that of Assyria), the view above indicated is confirmed. When he carried Judah into captivity he left the poor of the people "which had nothing, in the land of Judah, and gave them vineyards and fields at the same time," and put them under the hand of Gedaliah, the son of Ahikam (2 Kings xxv. 22 ff.; Jer. xxxix. 10; xl. 5). The probability is that the practice of Nebuchadnezzar was one which he had inherited from the kings of Assyria before him. Yet another thing; those who believe that the total population of Israel was deported to the regions beyond the Tigris and Euphrates, must forget the difficulties of transportation in the days of Sargon. The population of Palestine must still have been very great, even after the fullest weight is given to the devastating effects of Assyrian methods of "frightfulness," and the lessening of the population in consequence. Menahem had in his dominions sixty thousand "mighty men of wealth"—a number that implies a general population of possibly two millions. Though the kingdom of Hoshea was less than that of Menahem by the loss of Galilee, still the population left in the land could not be less than half a million. A horde of captives of that size passing through

Coele-Syria to Carchemish, and from thence down the Euphrates, would lay the whole country bare, and would empty of provisions the magazines of every store-city on its route. The consequence of this would be that the armies of Assyria would be unable to pass that way for some years to come.

We have further the direct evidence of Sargon's own inscriptions—contemporary documents, records of the events made when they happened. A monarch would be little likely to minimise his own exploits when he had them recorded on the walls of his own palace. In his account of the conquest of the land of Israel and capture of Samaria, Sargon does not claim to have carried away all the inhabitants of the land—he asserts only that he took 27,280 of them. The population of the province of Samaria must have been vastly greater than that. If the numbers of the armies which the kings of Israel are recorded to have assembled are to be taken as not historic, yet the account of the tribute exacted by Tiglath-Pileser (Pul) has every appearance of being so, and the method Menahem took to raise the amount has every look of probability. As above we saw what population that involved—approximately twenty times the number Sargon says he carried away. We are not, however, reduced to arriving at a decision by deductions like those above. It is clear that Sargon carried away only a portion of the inhabitants, for he adds, "I changed the government of the country and set over it a lieutenant of my own"; instead of a subject king like Hoshea, there was now to be an Assyrian viceroy. We have seen that it is not impossible that Hezekiah was that viceroy. Sargon continues, "The tribute of the former king I imposed upon them." The Ninevite king would not appoint a viceroy over empty fields, or expect them to pay him a tribute.

We have already said that it was the intention of the Assyrians to remove from any province, the loyalty of which they suspected, all notables—every one who could prove a centre of rebellion, or a strength to it when it had begun. This was a plan that was admirably fitted to secure the end at which they aimed. When these persons arrived at their new abode they would find themselves surrounded

by people whose language they did not understand, with whose customs they were unfamiliar, whose religion it might be they despised. Men in such circumstances, however great their ability or their hatred of the rule of Assyria, would be impotent for political disturbance. If those who had been the natural leaders of the nation into the bounds of which they had been introduced had been sent to replace them in the land whence they had come, then in both countries there would be leaders without followers, and followers without leaders. In the account of the captives that Nebuchadnezzar took with Jehoiachin (2 Kings xxiv. 14) we have the classes of persons who were liable to deportation, "the princes and all the mighty men of valour . . . all the craftsmen, all the smiths." All metal workers, and generally all who could help in producing munitions of war, all scribes whose knowledge of the art of writing might be put to political uses—all the priests and the prophets, all who could give a religious sanction to rebellion would be carried away.

We learn from the scenes portrayed on the Ninevite marbles that the captives were not debarred from conveying much of their property with them to their new abode. Consequently when they arrived at the new country assigned to them they would have much of the influence over their new neighbours that wealth always has over the poor, who alone would be left in the region to which they had come. Education and habit of command would tell despite the differences of language and religion, and the difficulties in the way of intercourse which these entailed. The influence of the colonists on the residuary inhabitants would be concurrent with the influence the residents would have on the colonists. The difficulty of language would be lessened in the case of South-Western Asia by the widely diffused use of Aramaic. This would tend to displace the native tongue, and profoundly modify it even in those cases when it did not drive it out. In religion the views of heathenism as to the local restrictions of divinities—gods who were gods of the hills and not of the valleys—would tend to make the religious views and practices of the otherwise despised remnant potent. Customs would also tend to assimilate.

After all things are considered, when the residual population left in the land after the devastating campaigns of the Assyrians is put at its lowest probable figure, and on the other hand the number of the intruded colonists reckoned at the highest, still the mass of the inhabitants would be Israelites. There would also be the small remnant of the Canaanites who still survived. From an imperfect inscription of Sargon (Schrader, *Keilinsch.* i. 268) it would seem that shortly after the deportation of such captive Israelites as he did remove, he sent colonists to occupy their places. The statement these colonists make, as recorded in Ezra iv. 7, shows that they regarded Esarhaddon as the monarch responsible for their presence in Palestine. But in verse 10 of the same chapter they claim to have been brought thither by "the great and noble Asnapper," who is in all probability to be identified with Asshur-bani-pal. From this it may be deduced that the colonists were sent into Palestine by relays. This would tend to make the influence of the Israelite remnant more powerful; the small number of scattered colonists would readily fall under the influence of their more numerous neighbours, so that by the time that the next band arrived the leavening with Jahveism had proceeded a good way. Thus it was said that the earlier English colonists in Ireland became in subsequent generations *Hibernis Hiberniores*. Moreover, the different relays did not in all likelihood come from the same places as their predecessors; thus they would be separated from them by as great barriers of language, custom, and religion as from the original inhabitants. When on the weakening of the Assyrian Empire Josiah assumed dominion over Northern Palestine, his treatment of the priests of the High Places implies that he regarded the mass of the inhabitants as Israelites over whom in virtue of his Davidic descent he could claim to be king, and whose worship at the High Places he could treat—indeed was bound to treat—as heretical; and this according to the ideas of those days was equivalent to being treasonable. Josiah's reformation seems to have had a deep effect on the Northern Israelites. After Ishmael the son of Nethaniah had slain Gedaliah the son of Ahikam, it is recorded that "Fourscore men came from Shechem, from Shiloh, and

from Samaria with offerings and incense in their hands to bring to the House of the Lord" (Jer. xli. 5) with all the signs of mourning, as it was only to the ruins of the Jerusalem temple that they could bring their offerings. These Ephraimites had accepted Josiah's reformation and had acknowledged the Solomonic shrine as their *qiblah*, and regarded even its ruined site as sacred so far as important sacrifices were concerned. These worshippers came to Mizpah long after the Assyrian colonists had been established.

It is necessary for a little to consider from whence these colonists were brought. Some it is recorded were brought from Babylon. Historically, it is intrinsically very probable that citizens from Babylon would be deported to Palestine. As the sacred capital of the Assyrian Empire, as much older than Nineveh, the pride of the Babylonians was offended by the precedence over them taken by the more recent city in virtue of its being the Imperial residence. Incited to rebellion by Merodach-Baladan, and assisted in it by him, the Babylonians were in a state of chronic unrest. Sennacherib, after numerous campaigns and victories over the Babylonians, interspersed with efforts at conciliation, determined to destroy the city wholly; which destruction he set about systematically and thoroughly. This would be accompanied doubtless by extensive deportations. These in all likelihood had begun in the reign of Sargon, during which the intervention of Merodach-Baladan and his Chaldæans began. Esarhaddon rebuilt Babylon and assumed the title of King of Babylon. Cuthah is identified by Dr Pinches as Kutu, a place in the neighbourhood of Babylon, devoted to the worship of Nergal. It would naturally follow the lead of Babylon and share in its vicissitudes. There is greater difficulty in the identification of Ava. From the names of the deities they worshipped, Conder would localise the Avites at Accad and therefore nearer Nineveh. It is scarcely possible that the Hamath of this passage can be the Hamath of Northern Syria; communication between it and Palestine was too easy for the purposes of the Assyrian deportation being carried out. Hamath, however, is a common Aramaic name; probably it is in Mesopotamia that the Hamath of this passage is to be sought. There is

some discussion as to the locality of Sepharvaim; a number of commentators maintain that it is Sibrain in Syria, but the same political objections, that must be urged against Hamath of Syria, apply to Sibrain. The probability therefore is that the old identification of Sepharvaim with Sippara is after all correct. It would thus seem that the body of the colonists were Semites from the region of Mesopotamia. What has been said as to the inhabitants of Central Palestine applies also to the deportations of Tiglath-Pileser from Galilee, their place probably being supplied by colonists from the same quarters.[1]

It may be thought that it is antagonistic to the view above maintained that although the Israelite inhabitants of the Northern Kingdom were greatly reduced in numbers by the ravages of the Assyrians (those early apostles of "frightfulness") in war, they still were the predominant element in the population, that the colonists appeal to Esarhaddon to be taught "the manner of the God of the Land," and the consequent mission of the priests to teach the knowledge they professed to desire. This, however, does not in reality disprove our assumption. Laying aside the possibility that this appeal was a covert petition to be reponed in their own land—it must always be remembered that in every heathen religion ritual was all important. That a sacrifice should be acceptable to the deity to whom it was offered, it was imperative that in offering it the right gestures be used in the right order; the correct titles given to the divinity when addressing him; the proper terms of dedication used; probably these were couched in archaic language. Every one of these elements was regarded as of the utmost importance. These the colonists would not be sure that the simple peasantry could

[1] What has been said above exhibits the absurdity of the view maintained by Dr Paul Haupt that our Lord was not a Jew but of Aryan descent. He thinks that the deportations of Tiglath-Pileser were total, which they were not; that the colonists sent to replace those carried away were Aryans, of which there is no proof; the assertion of Dr Paul Haupt is scarcely evidence as to what happened twenty-five centuries ago. He assumes that, when Simon the Maccabee removed back to Judea such Jews as had settled in Galilee, he left none of Israelite descent. Of course Haupt maintains against Matthew and Luke that Christ was born in Nazareth not Bethlehem.

know. Only the priests of JHWH would be the custodiers of such knowledge. As we have seen, priests and prophets would be among those deported, as they would be specially liable, among a fanatic race like the Israelites, to be leaders of revolt. In answer to the appeal of the colonists, a priest, or more probably priests were sent, and one of them made his abode in Bethel. As this was one of the principal schismatic shrines established by Jeroboam, it may be assumed that the worship taught was that of the High Places denounced by the prophets.

The teaching of these priests seems to have been successful, if one may judge from the prominence given to the destruction of High Places, and the slaughter of the priests of them, in the account of Josiah's reformation and of the extending of it to the territory of Israel. When the inhabitants of Northern Palestine again come into notice, Zerubbabel had commenced rebuilding the temple at Jerusalem; the Samaritans then claim to be allowed to share in the work as having been themselves worshippers of JHWH from the days of Esarhaddon. The wish to participate in the restoration of the Jerusalem temple implies that the colonists had been won over to adopt the views as to the superior sanctity of the shrine on Mount Zion, implied in the prophetic reformation begun by Hezekiah, and by Josiah resumed and extended to Israel. It may seem to contradict the predominance of the Israelite element that these correspondents of Zerubbabel claim to have been brought into the land of Israel by Esarhaddon. But the colonists, as we have seen above, from their wealth, education, and habits of command, would probably occupy a position of influence not altogether unlike that of the Norman nobles in England in the days of King John, who, although as to numbers very much the minority in England, yet claimed to be the spokesmen of the people whole. Their reference to Esarhaddon might be intended to meet objections based on the alien origin of these colonists; even they have been worshipping JHWH for more than a century and a half, as they did not belong to the races excluded from the House of JHWH for ever, they might claim to be received as proselytes; the case of the Israelites by descent was beyond discussion. It is to

be observed that their claim to be genuine worshippers of JHWH is not denied to them by Zerubbabel and Joshua the High Priest, only they assert that to the Jews and Benjamites alone had been entrusted, by the Persian king, the work of rebuilding the temple.

As the relatively small infusion of Norman blood into England did not seriously alter the predominantly Teutonic character of the people, so the coming of the Assyrian colonists did little to dilute the Israelite blood of the inhabitants of Northern Palestine. Hence whatever claim identity of race may put forward to be heard as to religious practices or tenets of any people, the Samaritans can make that claim as to the religion of Israel.

It is a matter of minor importance in regard to our argument, but still it is worthy of note that the personal appearance of the Samaritans suits our contention. They are, as a community, tall and fine looking. Their features represent the finest type of Israelite. In this view I am supported by several other observers. On this question, see Montgomery, p. 26.

CHAPTER II

THE HISTORY OF THE SAMARITANS

If the history of the Samaritans showed that they were in constant friendship with the Jews, and that in all religious matters they followed their lead submissively; if in short Samaritanism was merely a pale reflection, perhaps a little distorted, of Judaism, then the evidence of the Samaritans would not have the same value. If further they showed an easy facility in taking on the characteristics of those with whom they came in contact, ready to alter or modify their religious practices at the bidding of any predominant power, there would be a further lessening of the value of their testimony. If on the other hand there was a mutual jealousy and suspicion between the Jews and Samaritans, if each was willing to impute to the other the worst practices in conduct and the most erroneous doctrines in regard to creed, if each endeavoured to take the political attitude that would be most embarrassing to the other, in such circumstances it is difficult to imagine any slavish following on either side. So far from being ready to adopt the opinions of those who had secured the Imperial power in South-Western Asia, the Samaritans have been consistently persecuted by each of these in turn; that there was an exception during the time of the Seleucid supremacy we know only on the suspect evidence of Josephus. The religious independence of the Samaritans, alike in regard to the Jews and in regard to their Gentile neighbours, is the thesis we hope to prove by the study of their history, of the persecutions they endured, and the vicissitudes they underwent.

The history of the Samaritan people might be said to

begin with the revolt of the Northern tribes from the rule of the House of David under the leadership of Jeroboam. This was, however, only the final expression of a cleavage dating much further back in the history of Israel. It had been seen in the struggles for supremacy between David and the House of Saul, and in the ease with which Sheba the son of Bichri, on the very morrow of the overthrow of Absalom, secured a following. In the yet earlier days of the Judges, Judah and Simeon kept themselves aloof from the Northern and more advanced tribes. When Deborah and Barak delivered Israel from the yoke of the Canaanite oppressors, the Southern tribes did nothing; what is more striking, they do not seem to have been expected to render any assistance. While the divisions of Reuben are commented on, and the Reubenites are taunted with their continuance by the sheep-folds, and contemptuous reference is made to the excuses advanced by Gilead, Dan, and Asher to cover their inaction, and Meroz is bitterly cursed, nothing is said of the absence of Judah and Simeon from the army of Barak. In the history of the period of the Judges, the Southern tribes have nothing of the prominence in the narrative that is given to Ephraim. When Eli was judge there seem, from the prominence of Shiloh as the national shrine, to be signs of a tendency towards national unity. This was deepened under Samuel, until it found its final expression in the national selection of Saul as king. Toward the latter years of the reign of Saul the tribe of Judah seems to have transferred its allegiance to David. On the death of Saul the difference between the North and South became open war. Later the Northern tribes accepted David as their king. The union of Israel achieved by his father, Solomon endeavoured to consolidate by the erection of the temple at Jerusalem. The ease with which the arrogant folly of Rehoboam broke it up, shows that the process of unification had not gone very deep nor been very thorough.

The original difference between the two sections of the people, due to the predominantly pastoral character of the tribe of Judah, in contrast with the widely spread agriculture of Ephraim and Manasseh, and the tribes that possessed the pre-eminently fertile plain of Jezreel, was accentuated

during Solomon's reign, and after it, by a religious difference. In the South, on account of the presence in their territory of the temple—the splendid national shrine—the priesthood occupied a position of influence which the priests of the Northern High Places, even those of Bethel or of Dan, never had. On the other hand, the prophets in the Northern Kingdom had a political power which they had not in the South. Through their schools, the prophets could arrange concerted action all over the country. It would seem that these prophetic guilds carried organisation so far as to have a sanhedrin of elders for themselves (2 Kings vi. 32). There was, however, nothing of this in the South, the House of David reigned with priestly and prophetic sanction, and moreover had the prestige due to age and to the memory of the glory of David and the splendour of Solomon. In the North the violent changes by which dynasty succeeded dynasty, allowed none of them to become rooted in the traditions of the people, and there the kingly office never had the position to balance the influence of the prophets. All this tended to produce a radical difference between the two branches of the Israelite nation. In the North the religion was essentially prophetism, while the ritual and consequently the priesthood occupied a strictly subordinate position. In the South the king was a sacrosanct person, he was the Lord's anointed, and the prophets affected the course of national politics not directly but as advisers of the king or princes. The High Priest, as presiding over the splendid shrine on Mount Zion, had a position second only to the king. In the North there was no such dignitary; and further the king in Samaria had none of the sanctity of the Lord's anointed. There was no influence in the religious field to balance that of the prophets. Under Hezekiah and Josiah, when the Northern Kingdom had fallen, there certainly was an assimilation of the religious position of the Northern Kingdom to that of Judah. The High Places of Samaria were destroyed, their altars desecrated, and their priests slain, and all the remnant of Israel acknowledged the temple on Mount Zion as the national hearth. This assimilation was but short-lived; with the death of Josiah after the battle of Megiddo, all this came to an end. The sovereigns that followed in the

Southern Kingdom had little religious character and even less influence by which to maintain this assimilation, even if they had been in sympathy with it.

After the death of Josiah till the arrival of Zerubbabel and of Joshua the High Priest in Palestine, during the reign of Darius Hystaspis, we know nothing of Samaria or of the Samaritans. These two had come from Babylon authorised by Darius to rebuild the temple in Jerusalem. As we have already seen, the Samaritans approached the Jews with an offer to assist them in their work; but Zerubbabel rejected the offered help. The leaders of the Northern Israelites identify themselves with the Assyrian colonists. The rejection of the proffered assistance by Zerubbabel was directly at variance with Josiah's comprehensive invitation to the inhabitants of Northern Palestine to join in celebrating the Passover, and was a continuance of the feud in which Ephraim envied Judah and Judah vexed Ephraim. This treatment roused the wrath of the Samaritans, and they informed the Persian local governors that the Jews intended to rebel. Certainly Zerubbabel's Davidic descent, taken in connection with some of the statements of the prophets Haggai and Zechariah, made the accusation at least plausible. After something like three-quarters of a century, first Ezra arrived at Jerusalem and then Nehemiah. At this point of time the Samaritans were under the governorship of a countryman of their own, Sanballat the Horonite, that is a native of Beth-Horon. His name is Assyrian and means "San (the Moon god) revivifies." This fact does not prove him not to be a genuine Israelite, any more than does the fact that Zerubbabel was also known by the Assyrian or Babylonian name Sheshbazzar, disproves his claim to Davidic descent.

By the time that Ezra and Nehemiah arrived in Jerusalem the feelings occasioned by Zerubbabel's refusal of the help of the Samaritans appear largely to have evaporated. The relations between the inhabitants of Judea and those dwelling in the territories of the Ten Tribes are of the friendliest description. There had been numerous intermarriages, a proof that the claim to Israelite descent was tacitly allowed. The fact that Eliashib had prepared a chamber for Tobiah

in the temple, showed that Tobiah had claimed to be an Israelite and to have the right to worship at the central shrine, and that the High Priest had allowed both those claims. It is hardly possible that the term "Ammonite" applied to Tobiah was other than a nickname—a worshipper of Moloch would be little likely to desire to be called by a name which means "JHWH is Good." Such nicknames have been common in all ages; thus Ludovico Sforza, Duke of Milan, in the end of the fifteenth century was called "Il Moro," not because he was a Moor but because of his dark complexion. One may be permitted to doubt how far the excessive zeal of Ezra and Nehemiah was in accordance with the Divine plan, and how far it was due to the narrow legalist position which degenerated, some centuries later, into Pharisaism.

These marriages, into which so many of the leading Jews had entered, were declared by Ezra to be illegal. He apparently grounded this decision on the warning in Exod. xxxiv. 16, addressed to the Israelites, in prospect of entering Canaan, against taking the daughters of the land to their sons to wife, lest they should lead them to become idolaters. Those with whom these marriages had been contracted were neither Canaanites nor idolaters. This narrow interpretation of the Mosaic warning led to the religious schism which, perpetuated to the present day, has separated the Jews from the Samaritans. One instance of these intermarriages deserves special attention. In the book of Nehemiah (xiii. 28) we are told that "one of the sons of Joiada, the son of Eliashib the High Priest, was son-in-law to Sanballat the Horonite"; Nehemiah adds, "therefore I chased him from me." Josephus (*Ant.* XI. vii. 2; viii. 2) says that a nephew of this man whom Nehemiah chased from his presence, a hundred years later, married the daughter of Sanballat, the Governor of Samaria; this nephew Josephus calls Manasseh, and his wife Nicaso. From the Assouan papyri there is, to a certain extent, a confirmation of the Biblical narrative, as they contain an appeal for assistance against their Egyptian oppressors addressed to the "sons of Sanballat," who occupy a position of influence in Samaria. This was in the reign of Darius Nothus. Josephus further

relates that the elders of Jerusalem, indignant that a brother of the High Priest should marry a foreigner, "commanded Manasseh either to divorce his wife or not approach the altar." He adds, "There was now a great disturbance in Jerusalem, because many of the priests and Levites were entangled in these marriages." It seems an improbability, which amounts almost to an impossibility, that after the solemn public repudiation of such marriages only a century before, the practice should so soon become general again. Josephus makes Jaddus (Jaddua) — the brother of this Manasseh—contemporary with Alexander the Great, the nephew of a man who was of marriageable age more than a hundred years before. This is not absolutely impossible, but from the fact that the High Priesthood followed the line of primogeniture, it is extremely improbable. Had Josephus been careful of chronology his statements would have deserved greater attention. He, however, is vague and inaccurate to an extraordinary degree. According to him, Nehemiah is the cup-bearer not to Artaxerxes but to his father Xerxes. By Xerxes, Nehemiah is sent to Jerusalem in the twenty-fifth year of his reign; but Xerxes was assassinated in his twentieth regnal year. Moreover Josephus drops a whole century of history, making Darius Codomannus the successor of Artaxerxes Longimanus. The chronology of the Talmud, in this instance, is preferable to that of Josephus; it makes, not Jaddua, but Simeon *hatz-Tzaddiq* the contemporary of Alexander the Great, and the interview with the conqueror, which Josephus describes as taking place with Jaddua, the Talmud assigns to Simeon (Yoma, 69*a*). As the grandson of Eliashib whom Nehemiah drove from his presence is not named, the name Manasseh, which Josephus gives to his hypothetical nephew, may be assumed for the sake of convenience to designate the son-in-law of Sanballat. It seems not improbable that the consent which Josephus says he got from Darius Codomannus to build a temple on Mount Gerizim, he actually got from Darius Nothus. The Israelites of Upper Egypt, when they appeal to the "sons of Sanballat," do so as to co-religionists; hence the worship of JHWH must have been established in Samaria. Assuming that this was the case, then the worship

set up by Manasseh would be in complete agreement with that in Jerusalem; Mount Gerizim would repeat exactly the ritual of Mount Zion.[1]

When the Hellenic Empire succeeded that of Persia there was comparatively little change in the political status of the subject peoples. Under the Greeks as under the Persians they occupied a position of semi-independence. It is true that many cities became hellenised and adopted Greek constitutions, and also that the Diadochi (the successors of Alexander) had a liking for founding cities to which they gave their own names; these cities also were Greek. All this tended to spread the denationalising and hellenising influence of the Greek domination. This gradually sapped the independence of the subject peoples. At first Samaria seems to have fallen less under Hellenic influence than did Judea. There is a story told by Quintus Curtius (iv. 8) that while Alexander was in Egypt the Samaritans rebelled and burned alive Andromachus, the governor he had appointed over Coele-Syria. He hurried from Egypt and inflicted condign punishment on those guilty. As there is no trace of this in Josephus, although it was an occurrence which he would have delighted to record, as it reflected discredit on the Samaritans, and showed them as out of favour with the Macedonian conqueror, one may venture to doubt the truth of the statement. An assertion of Eusebius, as some interpret it, would indicate that Alexander's vengeance went further than could be deduced from what Curtius says; his statement in his *Chronicle*, as in the Armenian version, is, "Demetrius, King of Asia, called Poliorcetes, took the city of the Samaritans which Perdiccas had built;" this implies that the city had been wholly destroyed by Alexander. The whole transaction is thus liable to doubt.

There is more evidence of the relation of the Samaritans to the Jews in the similarity of the treatment meted out to them by Ptolemæus Soter. Josephus relates that when he

[1] That Josephus is practically without any historical value in regard to the history of the Jews under the later Persian Empire, we shall have occasion to show later, Chap. IV., pp. 111, 112. References in Rabbinic sources are not of much greater value. According to them, Darius and Cyrus were generals of Belshazzar, and Darius the Persian was the son of Esther.

had taken Jerusalem he removed to Egypt not only Jewish but Samaritan captives and settled them there (*Ant.* XII. i. 1). The notices of the Samaritans during the reigns of the earlier Diadochi are connected with military operations, and as the city of Samaria lay out of the line of march ordinarily followed by the Macedonian armies, they are rare. It became of more military importance in the time of Antiochus the Great. Polybius relates that after having captured Rabbath-Ammon and left a garrison in it, he sent Hippolochus with five thousand men to occupy positions about Samaria, "that they might take measures for the protection of all who acknowledged his authority"; this occurred in the first Syrian campaign of Antiochus (Polyb. v. 71). In a fragment from a subsequent book it is related of his second Palestinian campaign that, having overcome Scopas, Antiochus recovered Samaria and certain cities on the east of Jordan (Polyb. xvi. 39, quoted in Josephus' *Ant.* XII. iii. 3). From this it is obvious that Samaria, no more than Judea, was a factor of any importance in the struggle between the Lagids and the Seleucids for the supremacy in South-Western Asia; notwithstanding that the lengthened sieges it had endured during the earlier periods of its history might have led to the city being appreciated as a place of strength. From all this nothing can be learned of the actual condition of the Samaritan people or their relation to the Jews in the matter of religion.

The removal of Samaritans to Egypt by Ptolemæus Lagi, along with the captives of the Jews, gave an opportunity for their rivalry being carried into the *diaspora* of both peoples. When by the order of Ptolemæus Philadelphus the Septuagint translation was executed, there was, so far as Jewish tradition goes, no mention of the Samaritans. There seems, from statements in the Fathers, however, to have been a translation of the Samaritan Pentateuch referred to by them as the *Samariticon*.

The principal occurrence in the controversy in Egypt between the Jews and the Samaritans is the dispute alleged to have been held between representatives of the two sections of Israel before Ptolemæus Philometer, as recounted respectively by Josephus and Abu'l Fatḥ. According to

the former historian the Jewish representative, Andronicus the son of Meshullam, argued the Jewish case so convincingly that the Samaritans were never heard but were put to death out of hand. The account given by Abu'l Fath of course represents the discussion having a totally different conclusion; according to the Samaritan authority the discussion took place on the occasion of the proposed translation of the Law into Greek.

With the accession of Antiochus Epiphanes, and the ambitious projects he formed for the conquest of Egypt, Palestine assumed a new prominence. This was increased by the efforts of Epiphanes to coerce the Jews into abandoning their faith. Our principal authority for the history of the Samaritans at this time is necessarily Josephus. His evidence is always to be taken with a reservation as his bias against the Samaritans is unconcealed. This appears very markedly in his account of the position taken up by the Samaritans during the persecution of the Jews by Antiochus Epiphanes. Josephus declares it to be the general policy of the Samaritans to assert themselves Israelites whenever the Jews were in favour with the Imperial power, whatever it was, to which both races happened at the time to be subject; but that whenever the Jews were out of favour, the Samaritans denied that they had any connection with them, but were the descendants of the Assyrian colonists. According to Josephus (*Ant.* XII. v. 5), when the Antiochian persecution began the Samaritans sent an epistle to Antiochus in which they addressed him as "God manifest" and claimed to be Sidonians, "the Sidonians living in Shechem." It is to be noted that in his account of the Samaritan negotiations with Alexander, Josephus says that they declared themselves "to be Hebrews, who were called 'the Sidonians of Shechem.'" It is possible they made the same addition to the claim to be Sidonians in this epistle. They explained their observance of certain Jewish rites, such as the keeping of the Sabbath, and the special sacrifices which they offered on Mount Gerizim, by plagues which had befallen their forefathers. They made the assertion that the temple on Mount Gerizim had not been dedicated, and that the deity to whom it was erected was unnamed. It is somewhat confirmatory of

the authenticity of this letter that its contents do not quite agree with the account given of the general Samaritan statements by Josephus. He asserts that the Samaritans claimed to be descendants of the Medes and the Persians, while in the epistle a different origin is claimed—that they are Sidonians. The assertion that the deity to whom their temple had been erected was unnamed, may be a reference to the incommunicable name of JHWH. Their further request to be allowed to call it the Temple of Zeus Hellenius may mean an identification of Zeus, the supreme God of the Greeks, with JHWH. This was quite in accordance with Hellenic modes of thought, as may be seen in Herodotus, who identifies the various members of the Egyptian Pantheon with the different deities of Olympus. The title given to Zeus—*Hellenius*, "the Grecian," implies some such philosophical identification. The temptation was great to escape by any subterfuge from the savage persecution which the Jews were enduring at the hands of Epiphanes. They probably continued their ritual observances according to the Law; only when speaking to Greeks these sacrifices were declared to be offered to Zeus, while among themselves they acknowledged them as offered to JHWH.

As a result of their politic action, the Samaritans were undisturbed during the Maccabæan struggle. While the Samaritans took no active part in the conflict, they seem to have harassed the Jewish inhabitants of Galilee at the instigation of the Seleucid rulers. Apollonius when he went "to fight against Israel" "drew a great host out of Samaria," if we may credit 1 Maccabees iii. 10. When the Jews had, under the Hasmoneans achieved independence, they at first respected the neutrality of the Samaritans.[1] With the

[1] Indeed one passage (2 Maccabees xv. 1) represents the Samaritans as standing to Judas in a relation of at least benevolent neutrality—"Nicanor hearing that Judas and his company were in the *strong* places about Samaria" (places under Samaria), etc. Judas could not have occupied these places without at least the connivance of the Samaritans. Certainly historical accuracy is not a strong point with this author, still this representation intimates that the occupation of places in the Samaritan province with the consent of the inhabitants was not inconceivable. The Samaritans were thus not at enmity with the Jews at that time.

accession of John Hyrcanus this policy was changed; when the death of Antiochus Sidetes set him free from fear of interference from the side of Syria, fired by ambition he invaded Samaria and burned the temple on Mount Gerizim, which as stated above had been rededicated. Josephus, when he refers to this event in the introduction to the *Wars*, says that Hyrcanus, besides capturing Sikima (Shechem) and Garizin (Gerizim), subdued "the race of the Cuthæans"; a statement that would imply that at all events for a time Samaria was incorporated with the kingdom of Hyrcanus. To what extent they conformed to the Southern ritual cannot be known; even when they had no temple of their own, they do not seem to have worshipped in the temple in Jerusalem. Probably this state of matters continued during the reign of Alexander Jannæus and his widow—civil incorporation with Judea but religious independence. It is a singular fact that nothwithstanding the fierce invasion of Hyrcanus, the Samaritan annals do not hold him up to execration, but declare that he renounced his Judaism and became a Samaritan.

The position taken up by Galilee and its inhabitants in regard to the Jews and their religious revolt against Epiphanes is somewhat enigmatical. Judging by the policy pursued by the Sargonid kings of Assyria, the deportation of the inhabitants of Galilee attributed to Tiglath-Pileser would only extend to the more prominent personages; the majority of the people who were left would be Israelites. The part they played in the Maccabæan War was strictly subordinate. After Judas had conquered army after army and general after general of Antiochus, only then do the Galilæans manifest their sympathy with the Jews by informing Judas of the machinations and intended hostility of those of Tyre and Sidon and of the "foreigners resident in Galilee," *hoi allogeneis Galilaias*. Hostilities had begun before Simon, with three thousand picked men, arrived on the scene and put the enemies of Israel to flight and released the Jews, who had been made captives (Jos., *Ant.* XII. viii. 1, 2). Thereafter Galilee formed part of the dominion of the Asmonæans first, and then of the Herodians. This maintained their political union with Jerusalem, to

which also it would seem their religious allegiance had already been given.

The historical background of this has probably to be traced back to Assyrian times. After Tiglath-Pileser's deportation of the leading inhabitants and the intrusion of colonists from other parts of the Assyrian Empire, Galilee would be placed under a separate governor. This must have been continued under the Persians, as Sanballat was governor only of Samaria; a state of matters which remained unaltered under the Greek domination, alike of the Lagids and the Seleucids. As Josiah had assumed the rule over all Israel when the Assyrian Empire fell into decrepitude, by destroying the local High Places and requiring the people to offer sacrifice in the temple at Jerusalem, he united them religiously with Judea. Jews came as colonists, attracted not only by the fertility of the province but also by the fact that in Galilee, as they would not be in Samaria, they would be surrounded by their co-religionists. This process continued under the Herodians. Joseph, the putative father of our Lord, is an example of this. In the Roman War against the Jews under Vespasian, Galilee is regarded as so much a stronghold of Judaism that it is assailed first by the Roman Generalissimo. Every town became a fortress and only surrendered after a prolonged siege.

As the province of Galilee was under a separate rule from Judea, the Israelites resident in it might readily escape the fury of Antiochus. When the temple had been desecrated by "the abomination of desolation" being set up, the only worship open to the Israelites was that of the synagogue; consequently their rites could easily be concealed. They would have no motive to obtrude their faith on their Greek rulers, and so lead them to persecute. This may explain at once the Judaism of the Israelites of Galilee and their escape from persecution.

The fact that they had those who were Jews by religion not only to the south of them in Judea but also to the north in Galilee, makes the resolution of the Samaritans to maintain their religious independence all the more marked.

It is more difficult to settle what was the precise relation

of the Samaritans to Judea in the troublous times which followed. The quarrel between the two brothers, John Hyrcanus II., and Aristobulus, brought in the Romans, who would appear to have removed Samaria from under the dominion of the Jewish High Priest (Jos., *Ant.* XIV. iv. 4; *Wars*, I. vii. 7). The sympathies of the Samaritans seem to have been more with the Romans than with the Jews, as is seen by the fact that when Alexander the son of Aristobulus escaped from the custody in Rome to which Pompey had consigned him, and having invaded Palestine and seized the government had commenced to slay such Romans as fell into his hands; the rest betook themselves to Mount Gerizim where they were besieged by Alexander. The Romans clearly thought that they had more chance of safety among the Samaritans than among the Jews. Their resistance was successful as Gabinius raised the siege by defeating Alexander. During this period the Samaritans were both politically and religiously separate from Judea (Jos., *Ant.* XIV. vi. 2).

Under Herod, Samaria was once more united politically to Judea. The efforts he put forth to ingratiate himself prove that they did not relish being subject to any authority which had its seat in Jerusalem. To lead them to appreciate his rule and take kindly to it, Herod built a forum in Samaria, the remains of which are still standing, also a street of columns, the shafts of many of which still testify to the fact. He changed the name of the city to Sebaste, in honour of Augustus, in order to retain the favour of the ruler of the world. To curry favour further with Augustus, and at the same time please the Samaritans, he built a temple to the Emperor in Samaria. It is not impossible that Herod also rebuilt the temple on Mount Gerizim which had been burned by Hyrcanus. Although this is not recorded by Josephus, a reason may be found for his silence in his special hatred of the Samaritans as the religious opponents of Israel. There are several indications in the Gospels that in the days of our Lord the temple on Mount Gerizim was standing. When Herod's dominions were divided at his death, Archelaus received Samaria along with Judea. On the deposition of Archelaus, when Judea became a Roman province, Samaria

still remained united with it in all matters of civil government. In regard to religion and worship the Samaritans always kept themselves apart from the Jews. The relation in which the two peoples stood to each other may be seen in the conversation which our Lord had with the Samaritan woman. Her assertion, however, that the Jews have no dealings with the Samaritans, is not to be taken to the foot of the letter. In the tract *Masseketh Kuthim*,[1] in which are collected the various Talmudic *dicta* concerning the "Cuthæans," it may be seen that they are regarded as closer to the Israelites than the Gentiles. There are singular and somewhat contradictory restrictions in commercial transactions; while the Jews might not sell to Samaritans sheep for shearing, they might sell them if the sheep were to be slaughtered. One instance of restriction is due to the different way in which even in relatively ancient times the Samaritans reckoned the date of the celebration of the "Feast of Unleavened Bread." "We may not buy bread from a Samaritan baker at the end of Passover, until after three bakings." This period would need to be considerably increased now, as the date of the Samaritan Passover may be a month after that of the Jews. In religious matters the Jews acknowledged the Samaritans in some relations; though the Jews would not receive Sin-Offerings or Guilt-Offerings from the Samaritans, they might accept Vows and Freewill-Offerings from them. More remarkable is the fact that the Jews held that a Samaritan might legitimately circumcise a Jewish child. This tract maintains the embargo which Ezra laid upon marriages with the Samaritans. A singular evidence of the difference put between the Samaritans and sv. Gentiles is quoted by Montgomery from *Aboda Zara* (*The Samaritans*, p. 199): "An Israelite who has his hair cut by a Gentile must look in a mirror, but if by a Samaritan he need not look in a mirror," lest the Gentile barber should cut his throat, a thing he could trust the Samaritan not to do. In civil matters while the Jews and Samaritans were united under the same Roman governor they each had a separate "Sanhedrin." The Romans wisely permitted to the races sub-

[1] It has been translated by Dr Montgomery with illustrations from other parts of the Talmud (*The Samaritans*, pp. 197-203).

ject to them a very considerable amount of self-government. It is likely, that as the Jewish High Priest presided over the Jewish Sanhedrin, so the High Priest of the Samaritans presided over their Sanhedrin. When Pilate slew a large number of Samaritans, who, seduced by the promises of a fanatic prophet to show them the long concealed sacred vessels assembled in arms in the village of Tirathana, with a view to ascending Mount Gerizim, the Samaritan Sanhedrin made a successful appeal to Rome against him, and occasioned his recall from the government of Palestine.

The political attitude of the Samaritans during the principate of Nero, when the Jewish revolt against the Romans began, is difficult to understand. Florus and the other Roman governors who, by Josephus's account, goaded the Jews into rebellion, appear on the whole to have been favourable to the Samaritans. Certainly under Felix they seem to have been restless and quarrelsome (Tac., *Ann.* xii. 54), though it would seem that the governor was in part instigator. When the Jews actually rebelled against the Romans, the Samaritans do not appear to have acted at all in concert with them. On the other hand they do not seem to have manifested any hostility towards them, when by doing so they might have hampered the Jews and so rendered valuable assistance to the Romans, who would not have been slow to reward it. Yet while Vespasian was engaged in the conquest of Galilee, they assumed what Vespasian regarded as a threatening attitude, so much so that he sent Cerealis against them. They had assembled in great numbers on Mount Gerizim, but they were in want of water and had not provided themselves with food; yet when Cerealis, after a blockade of some length, advanced up the mountain and offered them terms they would not submit. The whole transaction has the appearance of being a hideous blunder. The fact that they had not seen to it that their cisterns were full, and that they had not a sufficiency of provisions, seems to disprove any hostile purpose. It would probably be some irregular religious gathering. Whatever the real meaning of their assembly, the end was tragic. When they would not listen to his overtures, Cerealis attacked them and slew eleven thousand

and six hundred. It might be that they could not make Cerealis understand their object, and that he, acting on the maxim that seems to have guided the Romans in their dealings with those they called barbarians, "When in doubt kill," slew all he found on Mount Gerizim (Jos., *Wars*, III. vii. 32). He seems to have destroyed Shechem in the course of his operations, as Vespasian afterwards rebuilt it and called it after his own name Flavia Neapolis, from which is derived the modern name Nablus. In the days of Justin Martyr, who was born there, it appears to have become a purely Gentile city. After the massacre which they sustained at the hands of Cerealis, the Samaritans do not seem to have again come under the suspicion of the Romans during the course of the Jewish War. So far as may be deduced from the action of Vespasian in regard to the rebuilding of Shechem, the Samaritans appear to have been left at peace during the subsequent reign of the Flavian dynasty.

For the later history of the Samaritans under the Roman domination, the student has no longer the guidance of Tacitus or Josephus, however unreliable they may in some respects be, the one from ignorance, the other from national prejudice. After the assassination of Domitian, with which the *Twelve Cæsars* of Suetonius ends, the history of the Roman Empire has come down to us mainly in the short rhetorical biographies of the emperors, to be found in the Augustan Histories, and in the curt narratives of Dion Cassius—shortened in the case of the books relating to this period into the meagre epitomes of Xiphilinus. Illustrious as were the reigns of Nerva, Trajan, Hadrian, Antoninus Pius, and Marcus Aurelius, from the unsatisfactory nature of the authorities which alone survive to us, little authentic is known of the history of the Empire during their rule. During this period, which Gibbon deems to have been a specially happy one for the inhabitants of the Roman Empire, although there are but the most cursory notices of the Samaritans, it may be assumed that they shared in the prosperity around them. Although the Samaritans could scarcely fail to be affected by the war occasioned by the claim of Bar-Cochba to be

Messiah, it yet can hardly have been to the extent represented by the Samaritan annals as will be exhibited in a subsequent chapter. Among the remains of buildings which may be traced on the top of Mount Gerizim, there are indications, as suggested in Chapter I., of a circular temple probably of the age of Hadrian, who had a favour for that shape. As it would be erected to some deity of the Olympian Pantheon, this would excite the fanaticism of the Samaritans, unless the deity were Zeus, and they like their ancestors in days of Antiochus, by identifying Zeus with JHWH contrived to adjust themselves to their circumstances. At the same time it must be noted that the Samaritan Joshua tells of a terrible persecution which the Samaritans endured at the hands of Adrinus (Hadrian). During the rule of the Antonines, when so many splendid synagogues were raised by the Jews, it is probable that the Samaritans were left at peace. The persecutions which Abu'l Fatḥ records as befalling the Samaritans during the reign of Commodus are by no means improbable. Lampridius in his life of him represents Heliogabalus introducing into the temple of the God whose name he bore, *Samaritanorum religiones*. As a Syrian he knew enough for his comprehensive syncretism to embrace within its compass not only the Jews and Christians but also the Samaritans.

There seems, however, no doubt that the Romans differentiated between the Jews and the Samaritans to the disadvantage of the latter; while the Jews were permitted to perform the rite of circumcision, in the case of the Samaritans the rite was brought under the sweep of an old edict against mutilation, *i.e.*, castration, and so forbidden to them under severe penalties. The evidence of Origen (*Contra Celsum*, ii. 13) indicates that it was mainly because of the rite of circumcision that the Samaritans were persecuted; the rite was permitted to the Jews but not to them. The fact that they sustained so many persecutions on account of the various rites of their religion proves their zeal, and further evidences the strenuous hold they retained on their faith.

With the Christianisation of the Empire which followed the conversion of Constantine, a change for the worse came

over the affairs of the Samaritans. In the persecutions which they had endured at the hands of Imperial Rome, there was always a political element, but the bitterer element of religious fanaticism was now added. The Church, which had so long been persecuted, now assumed the role of persecutor. Constantine himself did not persecute, possibly as his own conversion had been largely the result of political expediency, he had not the fanatic rage against those who differed from him, which filled the hearts of the bishops who had tasted the pains of persecution. He had seen the evil wrought by the persecutions of Diocletian, and was not likely to renew them. His son Constantius, who is called by Abu'l Fatḥ Taḥus, renewed the edict against circumcision. To this period would Dr Montgomery assign the episode of Garmun and Baba Rabba, although from the confused state of the chronology of the Samaritan annals it may be placed either a little earlier or a little later. The story as told in the Samaritan book of Joshua is as follows: When the eldest son of Nathanael, the High Priest, was born, he knew it was specially incumbent on him to have his son circumcised on the eighth day. It was then the Samaritan custom to perform the ceremony before the community assembled in the synagogue, but it was illegal by Imperial law to do so, and the penalty was death. Nathanael determined that the child should be carried to a cave, and that there before a select company he should be circumcised. In order not to attract attention, Nathanael sent a maid-servant with the infant in a basket to the cave. Garmun, whom Abu'l Fatḥ calls "prefect," met the girl and said to her, "Do what thou intendest and fear not." She informed Nathanael, and when he heard he was afraid, but said, "Let us commit the matter to God." When the girl was returning, again Garmun met her and said: "Bring him up in peace, my girl." Nathanael, afraid of what the prefect would do, went to offer him a bribe. Garmun, however, would only take three pence, and he took these for the singular reason, lest he should be thought to be forming a plot against the High Priest. Dr Montgomery thinks that this Garmun was not a prefect but a bishop, Germanus, who, as Bishop of Neapolis, took part in several

of the many Church councils of the reign of Constantius. The story indicates how the decree against circumcision was rendered ineffective through the connivance of those who, though government servants, did not believe in persecution. It also shows how constant the Samaritans were to their faith.

From the Church Fathers there is evidence in regard to the doctrinal position of the Samaritans. Although his testimony is not always satisfactory as not always accurate, Epiphanius testifies to the existence of the Samaritans as a sect, and gives some of the doctrines which he assumed that they taught. He mentions several heretical sects that sprang from them. Later Jerome notes the habits of the Samaritans in regard to several matters, as for instance that they, like the Jews, shun contact with Christians (in Esaiam lxv. 3); he regards them as schismatics for their reverence of Gerizim in preference to Jerusalem (in Esaiam ix. 2). He draws conclusions from the form of the letter "tau" as written by them (in Ezechielem ix. 4). As Jerome was for many years resident in Palestine, and as a Biblical scholar was curious to learn everything that had any bearing on Scripture, his testimony as to the Samaritans and their tenets is of peculiar value. He says nothing of the Samaritans being persecuted in his day for their religion, or forbidden the rite of circumcision. It would seem that at that time the decrees against them had been allowed to fall into desuetude; or perhaps they were held over the heads of the Samaritans *in terrorem* in order that the magistrates might exact *bakhshish*. Still, in that case, some reference might have been expected to the fact that they were under the ban of the Empire, if things were so.

With the permanent division of the Roman Empire into Eastern and Western, and still more when the Empire of the West fell, matters assumed a yet worse aspect for the Samaritans. While the Empire was still nominally Roman, it really had become Byzantine. Under the new régime the Samaritans were subjected to a grinding but irregular persecution. These irritating acts of oppression, without seriously weakening them, excited riots which at times became

important enough to be designated rebellions. While under Theodosius the Great the claim to exemption from the payment of certain duties was allowed to the Samaritans and the Jews, and in general the scales of justice were held even in any contests between the Samaritans and their Christian neighbours, the reign of the second Theodosius saw the imposition of new and galling disabilities. Under the Theodosian Code the rights of testamentary disposition are in the case of the Jews and Samaritans limited, much as it was with the Roman Catholics in Ireland a couple of centuries ago; they were not allowed to disinherit a child who had become a Christian, while the penalty of death was incurred by any Samaritan who induced a Christian to become a Samaritan. In order to limit the sect the more effectively, the Samaritans were not permitted to build new synagogues or even rebuild old ones. Along with Jews, pagans, and heretics, the Samaritans were deprived of the right to hold civic appointments.

These harassing regulations were not consistently applied; under one governor they would be as a dead letter, while under his successor only abundant *bakhshish* saved the community from suffering their utmost rigour. As was natural such treatment produced, as we have said, frequent riots. Quarrels arose on other accounts also; Joseph, whose tomb is near Nablus, was a saint not only of the Samaritans and the Jews but also of the Christians. In their mania for getting sacred remains for their churches, the Christians wished to remove the bones of the Patriarch. The Samaritans resisted this sacrilege; if we are to believe Abu'l Fatḥ, they were helped in their efforts by miraculous portents. Towards the end of the fifth century of our era, in the reign of Zeno, the Samaritans rose in rebellion, and after massacring many of the Christian community, set up as king a certain robber named Justasa. At first they were so far successful that they captured Cæsarea, and after the massacre of the Christian community there, celebrated a triumph. They were, however, soon overthrown by the Imperial forces. As a punishment for their rebellion the Samaritans were deprived of access to Mount Gerizim, and a church to the Virgin Mary replaced the temple.

They were forced to submit. This attempt at rebellion is recorded with variations in the Samaritan annals. Abu'l Fath assigns as a reason for this rebellion the intention of the Christians to carry away the bones of Eleazar and Phinehas the High Priests.

During the reign of Anastasius, the successor of Zeno, untaught by experience, the Samaritans made another uprising. In it, led by a woman, they seized Mount Gerizim—which as above noted had been fortified against them—slew the garrison, and took possession of the church which had displaced the temple. Procopius the historian, who narrates these occurrences, was Governor of Palestine at the time. He quickly suppressed the uprising; the leaders were put to death.

The sovereign who was at first the most oppressive to the Samaritans was Justinian. The edict he issued in A.D. 527, *de Hereticis et Manichæis et Samaritis*, was only a republication of earlier legislation against them, an indication that the penalties were not inflicted in strictness. Under Justinian the cruelly unjust law was administered with all severity. In two years these oppressive enactments produced a very serious uprising of the Samaritans. The account of this rebellion is given by Procopius. It spread through the whole territory of Samaria from Scythopolis to Cæsarea, but had its centre in the hill country. The rebels seem to have wreaked vengeance on the Christians for the wrongs done to them by the legislation of Justinian. As they had done in the earlier rebellion in the reign of Zeno, the Samaritans set up a sovereign for themselves, whom they do not seem to have designated by the theocratic title of King, but more ambitiously named him Emperor. Like Justasa of the days of Zeno, this emperor, whose name was Julian, was a bandit. This rebellion ran a course very similar to that of the earlier rebellion which it resembled in so many other respects. In the beginning it had success, and emphasised that success by a triumph accompanied with games. This triumph was celebrated not in Samaria but in Neapolis. As in the earlier case, the opening victories were followed by overwhelming defeat, and the pseudo-emperor was beheaded. Later Justinian became more

clement to the remnant of the Samaritan people. A considerable number of them had to assume a profession of Christianity; Procopius says, in his *chronique scandaleuse*, *The Secret History*, that the majority did so. Some of these converts of fear bribed the governors to allow them to carry on their old hereditary rites. Notwithstanding the transitory clemency of Justinian, the Samaritans again revolted, and in Cæsarea attacked and killed many of the Christians and burned their churches. The extreme of oppression was reached in the reign of Justin II.; the rescripts of that reign practically wholly outlaw them; many of the Samaritans fled to Persia. Singularly enough, although the Samaritans took refuge in Persia when Khosrou Purviz, the Persian King, conquered Palestine, the Samaritan chronicles tell that he crucified many of the Samaritans. Dr Montgomery argues that while the Persian conqueror was assisted by the Jews, he was opposed by the Samaritans. They appear to have welcomed Arqali (Heraclius) when he restored Palestine to the Empire.

The present date is a suitable one at which to pause and review the past history. Since the time when the colonists were sent by Esarhaddon—and they seem to have been the majority of them—to the date of the conquest of Palestine by "the sons of Ishmael," there is a space of thirteen centuries; nearly the same period separates the present time from that event. Two characteristics are to be noted; in the first place continued opposition of the Jews to the Samaritans, amply reciprocated by the Samaritans; next—from the beginning of our era to the end of the Roman rule in Palestine—the Samaritans have endured persecutions of ever-increasing severity, in which they were differentiated to their disfavour, from the Jews: the two features of Samaritan history are their pertinacious adherence to the faith they had inherited, and their independence of the Jews.

After Heraclius had regained Palestine, if not with the assistance of the Samaritans at least with their concurrence, he did nothing to preserve it to the Empire. The truth is that in consequence of the corrupt administration of his predecessors, the Empire was utterly exhausted, so that his splendid campaigns against Persia, far from strengthening

the Byzantine Roman Empire, really exhausted it only the more. At this point when the Persian Empire was exhausted with defeat and that of Byzantium equally exhausted by victories, a whirlwind from the desert smote both empires.

Away on the further side of Arabia from Palestine or Persia, in Mecca and Medina, had sprung up a new religion. Mohammed had proclaimed himself a prophet, and after various vicissitudes had first fled to Medina then from thence conquered Mecca. The conquest of Arabia followed. The death of Mohammed did not quench the zeal of his adherents; they passed the limits of Arabia and assailed Persia on the one side and the Empire of Byzantium on the other. After several campaigns lasting over a decade, during which external assault was helped by internal division and treachery, Persia was completely conquered and Yezgered compelled to flee the country. The date of the final battle was A.H. 22. While the struggle was going on to the east the Moslems advanced to the conquest of Palestine. The conflict was waged with varying fortunes, but at length all Syria submitted to the Arabs. The Samaritans welcomed the advent of the Saracens; they had no reason to desire a continuance of the oppressive rule of Constantinople. In consequence they were treated with a certain amount of favour by the conquerors. M. Lammens (*Califat de Yazid I^er^*, chap. xxiii.) says, on the authority of Baladhuri, that the reason of the favour shown them was that they had acted as guides to the Moslem armies, especially in the east of Jordan. Indeed M. Lammens thinks that they assisted them in arms, but that it became a point of honour with the Arabs to deny that the followers of the Prophet accepted any assistance from unbelievers. Yet the exceptional privileges which they received from Abu Obeida, that their land should be free of every impost but the capitation, seems to imply special services rendered to deserve them. This was in the Khalifate of Omar. At the same time earlier they, along with all the inhabitants, had suffered from the raid of Amru ibn el 'Aṣi. When the idea of plunder gave way to the thought of permanent conquest, the inhabitants were no longer indiscriminately plundered, but were regarded as subjects; and then it was

that the services of the Samaritans were rewarded with special treatment.

This favour lasted during the rule of the Ommeyads. With the reign of the Abbasides more fanatical ideas prevailed. The persecutions that resulted from the efforts at forcible conversion seem to have left deeper traces in the memories of the Samaritans than have the earlier acts of favour. Montgomery (*Samaritans*, p. 27 ff.) gives an account drawn from Samaritan sources, especially the supplements to Abu'l Fath, of the different disasters that befell the Samaritans under Moslem rule. While the Abbasides, fanatically orthodox as they were, treated with savagery all who refused to accept Islam, the Samaritans were not discriminated against; although they were not received into the position of quasi favour occupied by the Jews. On the death of Harun er Raschid, the khalifate was shared by his two sons Mamun and Amin, who soon quarrelled and declared war on each other. The opportunity afforded by this was seized by a pretender who claimed to be descended both from Ali and Mo'awiyah; he overran Syria and secured possession of Damascus. He appears to have set himself specially against the Samaritans; three of their cities were destroyed by his orders. As an evidence of the change in the spirit of the Mohammedans from the time of the Ommeyads, a Moslem governor of Nablus was killed by his co-religionists for favouring the Samaritans. As a consequence the land was filled with corpses, and crimes passed unpunished. Matters reached a climax when the Khalif Mutawakkil prohibited the Samaritans from performing the rites of their religion. Thus, whether the legitimate rule of the khalifs had the authority or rebels had usurped the power, whether the orthodox Moslems were in the ascendant or heretical sects, the Samaritans were equally oppressed and persecuted. Some of them fled away to other lands; the Samaritans assert that these fugitives came to the West, to Britain. Although with the fear of death before them some abjured the faith, others rather submitted to death. Dr Montgomery sums up the history of the period as "an almost unintermittent picture of the misfortunes of the miserable sect, persecuted by both orthodox

and heretical parties of Islam," and harried by the wars that swept over the debatable land of Palestine.

When the Crusaders, in their zeal to regain the places sacred to Christendom, swept in wave after wave from Europe into Asia, and at length set up the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem, the Samaritans were again brought in contact with Christianity. Singularly enough the Samaritan annals do not give any account of their relation to the kings of Jerusalem. On the other hand the chronicles of the Crusades are completely barren of references to the Samaritans. Yet they must have come in contact with them. The Crusaders were great builders and erected many churches. In Sebastiyeh, the ancient Samaria, they erected a church to John the Baptist; it is now a mosque. Four out of the five mosques in Nablus were originally Christian churches. They suffered in the campaigns which Saladin carried on against the Christians; after the battle of Hattin Nablus was wasted. Sultan Baibars in his ruthless war against the Christians in Palestine made the Samaritans suffer also. They were devastated also by the invasions of the Kharezmians and the Mongols in the thirteenth century.

More interesting and fruitful are the notices of the Samaritans to be found in the travels of the pilgrims, Jewish and Christian, during this period. The most interesting of these is the narrative of the Spanish Jew, Benjamin of Tudela, who travelled through Italy, Asia Minor, and Palestine about the middle of the twelfth century. His account of the Samaritans may be quoted: "Nablus the ancient Shechem in Mount Ephraim . . . is situated in the valley between Mount Gerizim and Mount Ebal. It is the abode of about one thousand Cuthæans[1] who observe the Mosaic Law only, and are called Samaritans. They have priests, descendants of Aaron, the priest of blessed memory, whom they call Aaronim. These do not intermarry with any but priestly families; but they are priests only of their

[1] The more common reading is "one hundred," but this is an impossible number, as Benjamin speaks of them claiming to be of the tribe of Ephraim and to have priests of the seed of Aaron. A mere handful of this size would not have a separate priesthood. More, the representations of other travellers suit the larger number.

own law, and offer sacrifices and burnt-offerings in their synagogue on Mount Gerizim. They do this in accordance with the words of Scripture, 'Thou shalt put the blessing on Mount Gerizim,' and they pretend that this is the Holy Temple. On Passover and holidays they offer burnt-offerings on the altar, which they have erected on Mount Gerizim from the stones put up by the children of Israel after they had crossed the Jordan. They pretend to be of the tribe of Ephraim, and are in possession of the tomb of Joseph, the righteous, the son of our father Jacob, upon whom be peace, as is proved by the following passage of Scripture, 'The bones of Joseph, which the children of Israel brought up with them from Egypt, they buried in Shechem.' The Samaritans do not possess the three letters *He*, *Ḥeth*, and *Ain;* they have not the *He* of the name of our father Abraham, so they have no glory; the *Ḥeth* of our father Isaac, in consequence of which they are devoid of piety; the *Ain* of our father Jacob, so they want humility.[1] Instead of these letters they always put an *Aleph* by which you may know that they are not of Jewish origin, because in their knowledge of the Law of Moses they are deficient in three letters. This sect carefully avoid being defiled by touching bones, corpses, or those killed by accident, or graves; and they change their garments whenever they visit their synagogue, upon which occasion also they wash their body and put on other clothes. These are their daily habits."

The admission which Benjamin here makes, that the Samaritans observe the Mosaic Law, and that their priests are the children of Aaron, are points to be noted in this passage; it seems to be an abandonment to a great extent of the position of orthodox Judaism that these Samaritans, who alleged themselves Israelites, were really Cuthæans, a view to which he afterwards returns. It is singular to find Benjamin asserting that the Samaritans "offer sacrifices

[1] These letters occur each in the names referred to. *He* ה in Abraham אַבְרָהָם and *hod* הוֹד; "glory" begins with ה. *Ḥeth* ח occurs in Isaac יִצְחָק and is the first letter of *hesed* חֶסֶד "piety." *Ain* ע occurs in Jacob יַעֲקֹב and it is the first letter of *anava* עֲנָוָה "humility."

and burnt-offerings in their synagogue on Mount Gerizim"; this certainly contradicts the Samaritan tradition which declares that the cessation of sacrifices dates from the return of the Samaritans from Harran—a mythical event it may be observed, but regarded as contemporary with the Jewish return from Babylon. In dating the cessation of sacrifice thus early, Samaritan tradition is clearly wrong, as at all events to the destruction of the temple on Mount Gerizim by Hyrcanus, sacrifices must have been offered. Even after that event our Lord tells the Samaritan leper to show himself to the priests (Luke xvii. 14), a command that would imply the offering of the cleansing sacrifices ordained by the Law. Still, as the Samaritan theologian Marqah, who was much earlier than Benjamin of Tudela, implies that no longer were sacrifices offered, this would indicate that the traveller had been led into a mistake by a too absolute credence of the statements of his dragoman. There is another confusion in regard to the "twelve stones"; they are still shown but not as an altar. They are situated, as has been stated above, near the foundations of a building which is alleged by some to have been the ancient Samaritan temple. It must be presumed that Benjamin of Tudela did not climb to the top of Mount Gerizim to verify what were alleged to be facts, but was satisfied to accept as true what was told him.

About a century after the visit of Benjamin of Tudela, Moses ben Nachman came to Palestine. When in Acco he found a Jewish coin of the Maccabæan period, the inscription on which he was unable to read, it was read to him by some Cuthæans resident there. This is evidence of a Samaritan community being in Acco, and also that in the days of Nachmanides the Samaritans had a script similar to that found in the extant copies of the Law of the tenth century.

Toward the middle of the fourteenth century the veracious traveller, Sir John Mandeville, in the course of his journey to the Holy Land, paid a visit to Nablus, or as he calls it Shechem, or Neapolis, and says that it is ten miles from Jerusalem. The distance is approximately forty Roman miles as the crow flies; it may have been that he used a German mile. He makes the same assertion as does

Benjamin of Tudela as to the Samaritans offering sacrifice on Mount Gerizim. It would appear that he had some intercourse with the Samaritans, as he is correct as to their theology, at a time when errors on this were common. He says, "They say that there is only one God, who created all things and judges all things." He seems to have been unaware of the limited extent of the Samaritan Bible; he says, "They hold the Bible according to the letter, and use the Psalter as the Jews do." He refers to their claim to be the genuine Israelites. "They say that they are the right sons of God; they say that they be the best beloved of God, and that to them belongs the heritage which God promised to His beloved children." Probably neither Sir John nor his interpreter had any sufficient initial knowledge of the Samaritans when he visited Nablus and began his inquiries, and in consequence neither knew what questions to put, nor understood properly the answers given him to those he did ask. He mentions the red head-dress they were required to wear, but seems to regard it as a matter of choice. He is by no means conspicuous for accuracy, as may be gauged by the fact that he credits Rehoboam with setting up the golden calves at Bethel and at Dan. Though as to the Samaritans his evidence is fairly accurate, yet on the question of the sacrifices on Mount Gerizim it may not be pressed.

About three hundred years after Sir John Mandeville's visit to Palestine, came Pietro della Valle to travel in the East. He was a Roman nobleman, and member of the literary and scientific society of Rome, the *Umoristi*. A disappointment in love led him to become a pilgrim. He visited Constantinople on his way to the Holy Land and stayed there thirteen months. The French Ambassador, M. de Sanci, in his desire to possess a copy of the Samaritan Pentateuch, directed the attention of Della Valle to the Samaritan people, and he visited their communities in Cairo, Gaza, Nablus, and Damascus. The narrative of his travels is written in an easy, interesting style. He gives an account of the various Samaritan communities which he had seen, especially of that in Nablus. He speaks of them as "Samaritan Jews whom the other Jews regard as heretics."

He refers to their rebellion in the days of the Emperor Zeno, and how they had cut the throats of the Christians, and what vengeance the emperor exacted. He must have had some Jewish informant, as he speaks of the Samaritans as Cuthæans. He devotes some time to the Biblical account of their origin, evidently from memory, for although it is generally correct it is not invariably so. From the fact that they had inherited errors, he declares "that they did not wish to read the other Biblical books, besides the book of the Law, that is to say, the five books of Moses. . . . The other books of Holy Scripture, which have been collected since, as the Prophets and the others, they do not receive and do not reckon them as canonical." He declares that "the priests of the race of Aaron" did not intermarry with the rest of the Samaritan community. This was the case not only in Nablus but also in Cairo. "When they met together," he says, "they sacrificed and performed all the ceremonies which were performed anciently in the Jerusalem temple, but according to the manner of the Samaritans." It is to be observed that Della Valle, like Benjamin of Tudela and Sir John Mandeville, asserts that the Samaritans offered sacrifices. His description of the dwellings of the Samaritans of Damascus is as follows: "They were houses outside the city, in gardens, splendid inside with gilding, but of little appearance outside;" this suggests a class of people desirous of being inconspicuous, a persecuted people, whose safety lay in being unnoticed.

Near the end of the seventeenth century, in the earlier part of which Pietro della Valle had visited Shechem, an English traveller, Henry Maundrel, starting from Aleppo, reached Nablus, or as he calls it Naplosa, on the 24th of March 1697. He says that the Samaritans have upon Mount Gerizim "a small temple or place of worship, to which they still are wont to repair at certain seasons for the performance of the rites of their religion." What these rites were he did not ascertain. He informs his readers that the Jews asserted that the Samaritans worshipped a calf, but that he thinks "has more of spite than truth in it." He had a prolonged conversation with the Samaritan High Priest who, as is the wont of the Samaritans, accused

the Jews of falsifying the text of the Pentateuch in putting Ebal for Gerizim as the mountain on which the Law was to be written, alleging the fact that Ebal was the mountain of cursing and Gerizim that of blessing, that therefore it would be more suitable that on the mountain of blessing the Law should be preserved; the priest referred also to the superior fertility of Mount Gerizim, a superiority which did not impress the traveller as very striking. Maundrel consulted the High Priest as to the precise force of the words in the Pentateuch translated "quails" and "mandrakes," and got answers which seem to have satisfied him.

In our rapid review of the history of the Samaritan people we have evidence from Scripture, from Josephus the Jewish historian, from Samaritan annals, from secular historians and from travellers, Christian and Jewish, which proves their continuous existence, at all events from the arrival of the Assyrian colonists in Palestine down to the present day. Even then if we had to do merely with descendants of those who received their knowledge of the Hebrew religion from the priests sent by Esarhaddon, their beliefs and practices would bear the impress of the faith and practice of a much earlier day. All the while there is evidence that there was an opposition, a rivalry between them and the Jews so great as to preclude any serious amount of borrowing by the Samaritans from that source. If the Samaritan claims be admitted, that they are the genuine children of Israel, and as has been shown the balance of evidence favours the view that despite the negligible admixture of foreign blood, the present Samaritans are the descendants of those who under Joshua conquered the land; thus their ritual really represents an uninterrupted tradition from primitive times. According to the traditional view of the origin of the Pentateuch, they have been in possession of the Mosaic Law for above three thousand years; according to the prevailing critical view, they have been concurring spectators of all the changes it has passed through since the return under Zerubbabel of the Jewish exiles, save what may have taken place in Babylon. There has been no break in the succession. After the fall of the Northern Kingdom the inhabitants of the territories of the

Ephraimite tribes continued their observance of the ceremonies of the Mosaic Law. They have circumcised their children even when obedience to the Mosaic precept meant rendering themselves obnoxious to the penalty of death; year after year they have celebrated the Passover on Mount Gerizim when they might; in their own houses when they were forbidden access to the sacred site. Throughout their long history they have been witnesses for the religion of Israel, and in many cases witnesses that have sealed their testimony with their blood.

In some respects the Samaritans are better witnesses than the Jews, and their testimony has more evidential value. The line of their tradition has not been broken by banishment from their own land, as that of the Jews has been since the overthrow of Bar-Cochba's rebellion. For a considerable while after that event the Jews were excluded from Jerusalem altogether. From this fact, where their method of observance in regard to any ceremony differs from that of the Jews, there is a *primâ facie* probability in favour of that of the Samaritans. Noticeably is this the case in regard to the Passover and the rite of circumcision. If Benjamin of Tudela is to be believed, supported as he is by Sir John Mandeville and Pietro della Valle, against the express testimony of the Samaritans themselves, then they were offering sacrifices and burnt offerings till the seventeenth century of our era; maintaining thus the Levitical Law in its entirety. It must be noted that as to the date when bloody sacrifices ceased, Samaritan tradition is distinctly wrong; they did not cease in the reign of Artaxerxes Longimanus. How long they continued to be offered after that time there seems to be no means of determining.

Were this a case of customary right pled before a court of law, the kind of evidence afforded by the Samaritans would be looked upon as exceptionally strong. It must be borne in mind that all law is founded primarily on custom. Were the question at issue one regarding "Right of Way," one in which evidence as to custom is most frequently called for, the testimony would be invaluable of one who not only had lived all his life in the district, and used

the path in dispute, but could invoke family tradition that his father and grandfather had used the pathway, and had given him to understand that their use of it had never been challenged. Of such a kind then is the evidence that may be drawn from the ritual and beliefs of the Samaritans as to the Religion of Israel.

CHAPTER III

MOSAISM IN NORTHERN ISRAEL

ASSUMING the conclusion at which we have arrived to be correct, that even after the deportation of many of the Israelites and the advent of Assyrian colonists, the Israelites still formed the great majority of the inhabitants of Northern Palestine, it may be further assumed that the religious views and practices of the colonists would be very much tinctured by those of their neighbours.[1]

This religious likeness to the Israelites would be increased into practical identity by the instruction which the colonists received from the priest or priests sent by Esarhaddon. Hence as a preliminary to a study of the worship and religious beliefs of the Samaritans of later days it is necessary to consider the doctrines believed and the ritual observances practised by the Northern Israelite tribes. Although it might, from what has already been seen, be assumed that even after the separation of Israel into two distinct states, Jahweism continued to be the religion of the North as well as the South, yet it is well to fortify this conclusion by collateral evidence.

One evidence of special cogency is the prevalence of proper names having JHWH as one of its elements. The eldest son of Jeroboam "who made Israel to sin" is "Abijah," *i.e.*, "JHWH is my Father." All the sons of Ahab, another monarch concerning whom Judæan records would be little likely gratuitously to relate anything favourable, whose

[1] It would seem, if the evidence of Tolstoi may be trusted, that a somewhat similar thing has taken place in the Caucasus, where the Christian Cossacks have imbibed a great deal of the manners and morals of the Moslem natives.

names have been recorded have all Jehovistic designations; Joash ("whom JHWH supports") who is left governor of Samaria when his father leads his army to Ramoth-Gilead, Ahaziah ("whom JHWH upholds") who succeeds his father, and Jehoram ("whom JHWH exalts") who in turn succeeds him. His steward is Obadiah "the servant of JHWH." The military commander who destroyed the House of Omri is Jehu ("JHWH is"); his father is Jehoshaphat ("JHWH is Judge"); his friend is Jehonadab ("whom JHWH impels"). The great Prophet of the Northern Kingdom is Elijah ("JHWH is my God"). Of the prophets who prophesy before Ahab in Samaria before he sets out to Ramoth-Gilead only two are named, Zedekiah ("JHWH is just") and Micaiah ("who is like JHWH"). The fact that the great mass of the names that have come down to us from that period are Jehovistic is evidence of how widespread was the reverence accorded to JHWH among the subjects and in the household of Ahab. This phenomenon is all the more singular, that in the beginning of his reign, Ahab seems to have done more than merely tolerate the worship of Baal (1 Kings xvi. 31), whose cult Jezebel had brought with her from Tyre. At the same time, not more than 7000 can be claimed as not having conformed in any measure to the worship of Baal (1 Kings xix. 18). The most probable explanation of this would seem to be that there was a deep-seated religious syncretism in Israel, natural to those whose attitude in acts of worship was political rather than theological. To the statesman the worst of religious crimes is intolerance, to the prophets, the worst sin was tolerance. The same antagonism appeared, three-quarters of a millennium later, in the disastrous quarrel between Judas the Maccabee and the Ḥasidim.

There is a phenomenon connected with Hebrew names which requires to be noted. Before the time of David, names involving "Baal" as an element are fairly common. The cases in which these names occur are not in inconspicuous families; the son of Saul who succeeded him on the throne was really named Eshbaal, "the man of Baal" (1 Chron. viii. 33), though scribes changed the name to Ishbosheth, which has the impossible meaning "man of

folly" (2 Sam. ii. 8); his grandson, the son of Jonathan, is called at first Meribbaal, "strife of Baal" (1 Chron. viii. 34), afterwards scribally altered to Mephibosheth, "destruction of folly" (2 Sam. ix. 6); also another son of Saul by his concubine Rizpah, called Mephibosheth in 2 Sam. xxi. 8, was in all likelihood really named originally as his nephew, Meribbaal. A son of David, born to him after he became king over all Israel, is named Beeliada, "whom Baal knows" (1 Chron. xiv. 7), though it is transformed to Eliada, "whom God knows" (2 Sam. v. 16). The name of no other foreign deity occurs as an element in Jewish names till Israel came under the dominion of an alien power. This indicates that Baal, the God of the Canaanites, was regarded by Israel as standing in a relation to them different from that in which did the deities of other heathen nations. To understand the reason of this it is necessary to go back to the conquest of the land.

When the Israelites crossed the Jordan we must assume that the numbers ascribed to them in the books of Numbers and Joshua are greatly in excess of reality. Instead of entering Canaan with a warlike host of more than six hundred thousand men, probably the real number would be somewhere about the tenth of that figure. This would represent a population of about a quarter of a million. Judging from the indications in the Tell Amarna tablets, Palestine was not densely peopled, probably the number of the inhabitants then did not seriously differ from the present figure that is approximately from three-quarters of a million to a million. The Israelite people as a whole would therefore be approximately equal to from a third to a quarter of the inhabitants which they found in Canaan. Had the native inhabitants formed a homogeneous mass the chance of the Israelites to effect the conquest of the land would have been slight. So far from this being the case they belonged, according to repeated numerations, to "seven" different nationalities. Some of the names that, from the connection in which they stand, might be reckoned national designations, seem rather to indicate the character of their dwellings. While the names the Amorite, the Hittite, and the Canaanite designated peoples of distinct national types, the Hivites and Perizzites really meant villagers as distinct from inhabitants

of walled towns. The Jebusites and the Girgashites seem to have been named from the locality in which they dwelt. The three leading nationalities appear to have been intermingled. A very similar state of things is seen in Palestine in the present day, where Kurd, Bedu, and Druse villages alternate irregularly. Unwalled villages appear then to have been relatively few. The body of the population lived in small independent fortified towns; most of them were monarchical, ruled over by a *patesi* or priest-king. Some of them appear to have been republics, as the league of the four cities of which Gibeon was the chief: it is the elders of the cities in question that treat with Joshua and the Elders of Israel. The towns belonging to the same race do not seem to have formed any league, each "city" was, as a rule, entirely independent and by itself. Such seems to have been the condition of matters in Babylonia when Assyria began to intervene in the affairs of Southern Mesopotamia. This rendered the conquest of the land much more easy of accomplishment to the *Beni Israel.*

It is a mistake to imagine that the conquest of Canaan was completed by Joshua; the territories assigned by him and Eleazar to the different tribes were really "spheres of influence" within which the conquests of each tribe were to be limited. The list of thirty-one cities enumerated with their kings (Josh. xii.) as conquered, does not imply that even in Joshua's lifetime they were permanently held. Jerusalem and Hebron although on that list have still to be conquered after Joshua's death (Judges i. 8, 10). The former, soon after its reconquest by Judah, must have been again regained by its original possessors, for in the story of the Levite and his concubine (Judges xix. 11), which is dated in the lifetime of Phinehas, the son of Eleazar, Jerusalem is in the hands of the Jebusites. What the several tribes seem to have done, was to settle in the territory assigned them, occupying such of the cities as they had captured, and whose inhabitants they had slain or expelled, watching for any favourable opportunity to increase their hold on the land.

Alike worldly prudence, as surrounded by a hostile population, and loyalty to JHWH who had given them the

land, ought to have led the Israelites to maintain a close union among themselves. So far from this being the policy followed, they scarcely ever, even in a limited degree, during the time of the Judges, seem to have recognised their national unity; never indeed unless when some foreign oppressor forced on them the duty of mutual help. Even this did so only to a very limited extent. Reference has been made above to the evidence afforded by the song of Deborah of the divisions in Israel by the fact that the absence of Judah and Simeon from the army of Barak is not even made occasion of rebuke. When Israel was delivered from the oppression of Midian by Gideon, he seems to have been followed only by the men of his own tribe, that of Manasseh. Not only was every tribe to a great extent independent, even the internal unity of the tribe was loose and indeterminate. The separate walled villages act as independent republics, each under its own senate of "Sheikhs," or Elders. Meroz is cursed by Deborah apart from the tribe to which it belonged; Gideon treats Succoth and Penuel as enemies although they are Israelite cities, a hostility which they had inaugurated. At the same time, taking the books of Judges and Samuel as they stand, the brazen altar in front of the Tabernacle was regarded as the sacred hearth of the nation, and the Tabernacle itself, the national shrine. Wherever it was, the Tabernacle was the symbol of national unity; to it in times of emergency gathered the Elders of all Israel (Judges xx. 1). The union of the tribes of Israel was, like that of the Hellenic cities by means of the Amphyctionic Council, largely sentimental, but for any practical purpose useless, unless popular sentiment ratified the decisions of the Elders who represented it.

Meantime the walled villages possessed by the Hebrews formed at first only an additional element in the congeries of nations which inhabited Palestine; in consequence, however, of the victories of Joshua at Beth-Horon and the waters of Merom, it was in all likelihood the predominant element. On every side were the cities of the Canaanite, the Amorite, and the Hittite. These Canaanite and Amorite cities, as has been learned from the excavations at Gezer and Lachish, were, at this period, irregular collections of

stone-built hovels, surrounded by earthen walls, with stone towers at the gates. Prominent in all of them was a High Place, with an altar, on which were offered gifts and sacrifices to the Baal of the city. Beside the altars rose monolithic *matztzeboth*, frequently if we may judge from Gezer, untrimmed stones of varying size, and fixed in stone sockets towered like masts the *asheroth*, sometimes round, sometimes square. Occasionally a covered building may have occupied some part of the sacred area, and also in other cases a secret cave beneath the floor where Thyestean banquets may have been held, and oracles delivered. In front of the gate of the city was the Maidan on which the riders exercised their horses, and within the gate a space, in which met the Elders of the city. Probably in the centre there was an open square, which formed the market-place.

When Israel, from being nomads, came into a land of fixed habitations and appropriated lands; when they took possession of cities which they had not built, and vineyards and olive-yards which they had not planted, the manners and customs of the original inhabitants would tend to have an important influence on them. Especially in matters of religion and worship would the influence of the earlier inhabitants be potent. The prominence of the High Place in each town they captured, and the idea deep-rooted in every savage mind of the local power possessed by the local deity must insensibly have affected them. It was against this influence that the Deuteronomic legislation was primarily directed. Surrounding influences were too strong, the Israelites did not cut down the *asheroth*, overthrow the *matztzeboth*, or break down the altars of the local Baals. Strangers from neighbouring cities, or even survivors of the inhabitants, who had perhaps been spared as slaves by the Hebrews who now occupied the city, or who having escaped the first onslaught of the conquerors returned in more peaceful times to their former homes, these might easily lead the men and women of Israel to adopt features of the old cult. Not impossibly the features that were most abhorrent, the cannibal feasts and human sacrifices, might be kept secret.

The effect on the Israelites of the religions of the inhabitants of the land into which they had come being so

obvious and well known, some study of these religions is necessary. While all the nationalities in Palestine at the time of the conquest are named separately, occasionally they are compendiously termed Canaanites (Josh. xvii. 13; Judges i. 9, etc.). When dealing with the question of religion in Canaan we cannot assume that the pantheon of the Canaanites and their ritual of worship were precisely the same with those of the Amorites and Hittites. At the same time the assimilative influences which effected so much in regard to the Israelites must have been at least as potent in the matter of these other nationalities. Further there is another side to be noted; inquirers have to beware of depending too much on hellenised interpretations of the beliefs of Tyre and Sidon. These are all late, written after the people had been to a great extent hellenised, and moreover are presented in a Hellenic dress for a Greek audience. The first phenomenon that meets the student is the prevalence of the name "Baal," followed by a place-name. But "Baal" means in such a connection "Lord of," "possessor of," *e.g.*, Baal-Gad (Josh. xiii. 5), Baal-Hazor (2 Sam. xiii. 23). On the other hand there are occasions in which the name "Baal" stands for the Supreme God, the rival of JHWH. Thus in the dramatic scene on Carmel, the question which Elijah would put to the test was whether Baal or JHWH was to be reckoned the Supreme Deity. So, too, Jehu's proclamation (2 Kings x. 18) implies that he intended to place Baal in the place of JHWH; at least that was what he intended the Baal-worshippers to understand.

This is not the place to discuss the historic evolution of religion and worship in general, or of the religion and worship of Canaan in particular. In regard to the latter there are, as has just been noted, special difficulties; these it is possible may be lessened by future excavations. While this is so, some of the phenomena connected with the relation of Israel to the worship of Baal would appear to be simplified if the local Baals were regarded as due to a species of religious degeneration. The universal Baal, the Lord of all, was worshipped with different rites in the different walled villages. Myths would naturally arise to explain them, which would involve Baal; the myths of different places

would conflict, till the Baal of one city would be held as a different person from the Baal of another. A similar process has gone on in Romanist countries as to the Virgin. Whatever their avowed creed, the peasantry act as if the Virgin of one shrine were personally different, endowed with different attributes from "Our Lady" of another. Another process may have been at work, analogous to the fetichism of West Africa. The Africans believe in a great Being too great to be approached with prayer or offering, and too good to work them any ill; but they believe also in far lesser beings, *genii loci*, inhabiting trees, rocks, pools, or even more insignificant objects as an oddly shaped stone. Unlike the great Spirit, the spirits that dwell in these objects are malevolent and easily offended, but may, if properly propitiated, prosper the undertakings of their votaries. (R. H. Nassau, *Fetichism in West Africa;* Andrew Lang, *The Making of Religion.*) Again we find an analogy in Romanism. In Roman Catholic countries more prayers are directed to the Holy Mother and the other saints than to God the Father or to Christ. A similar process appears to have taken place in Egypt where, according to Dr Wallis Budge, there was belief in a Supreme God, the Creator of all things, of whom the lower gods were attributes or symbols. In India, if the student of religion compares the theology of the Vedic hymns with the absurdities of modern Hinduism, he sees the same process. It would be difficult for the Jew, if animated at all with the harmonistic ideas to be seen so strongly in Herodotus, to avoid identifying JHWH and Baal. This would at once explain the ease with which the Israelites were seduced into Baal-worship, and how they came to introduce the name of Baal into the designations they gave their sons.

There seem to have been impure rites connected with the worship of the Baalim. The scenes at Baal-Peor imply that whoredom was connected with Baal-worship, although it is not stated. Human sacrifices followed by feasts on the victims seem proved indubitably by Dr Macalister's discoveries at Gezer. The fact that such elements were liable to come in, would be a valid reason for the prophetic denunciation of the sacrifices offered on the High Places.

If different modes of worship were in any way liable to arise, in consequence it might be, of the previous Canaanite or Amorite worship, then Polytheism would be a present danger.

Not improbably there would be strange ideas of the persistence, near the scenes where they had been worshipped, of the Baalim and Ashtaroth of earlier days; this, too, would form a danger to be met. Any misfortune befalling a person of a superstitious nature would be interpreted as due to the malevolence of the deity of the High Place whose dignity had not been respected, and this would result in a secret resumption of the idolatrous rites at his shrine. All these dangers, neither small nor few, might well account for the vehemence of the prophetic denunciation of the worship of the High Places. The influence of the Canaanite religion would tend to be all the stronger that there probably would be much of resemblance between the ritual of the one and the other; their ordinary sacrifices would be made with the same victims—oxen, sheep, and goats; the ordinary feasts of the people of the land would be arranged to suit the periods of the agricultural year, and according to the Mosaic Law the main feasts had a like relationship. This very resemblance would make the necessity for prophetic denunciation more urgent.

All this would suit perfectly with the common critically assumed origin of Deuteronomy. The prophets, painfully impressed with the evils which might result from the worship on the High Places, wishing to get a higher religious sanction for their condemnation of these irregular religious centres, invoked the memory of Moses, and compiled a book in his name, which represented the great lawgiver, before his death, giving final instructions to the people he had led. These discourses not only commanded the destruction of every place in which there had been a heathen shrine, its altars to be thrown down, its *asheroth* felled, and its *matztzeboth* overturned, but that there should be only one sanctuary for Israel. Only towards the very end of the Jewish monarchy were the prophets impelled to compose those discourses, when political destruction as the penalty of religious apostasy was impending. The roll containing them was hid, and as

intended, duly found. The discovery of the "Book of the Law" in the reign of Josiah, is the first appearance and publication of this pseudo-Mosaic legislation. It is beside the question to denounce this action of the prophets as immoral; they might imagine themselves inspired by the same Divine influence as had inspired Moses, and commanded to supply precepts omitted by the legislator. The book of Ecclesiastes is a standing example of the same literary device.

While it would occupy too much time to discuss adequately the intricacies of the Deuteronomic controversy, and would obscure the main line of the present argument, still there are difficulties in the way of accepting this hypothesis in its entirety which we would now submit. According to the critical hypothesis of which this, the assumed origin of Deuteronomy, forms an integral part, this book was the earliest book of ritual law.[1] Previous to this, ritual acts of worship had been performed according to rules traditionally handed down only among the priesthood. If that is so, how is it that Hilkiah says, "I have found *the* book of the Law?" If he had said, "I have found a book of precepts by Moses," that would have been the natural language of a man who only now discovered the existence of a book of legislation. His language implies that he knew the existence of Law-books, but that this was a copy specially individualised. If a copy of the Law had been placed at the foundation of the temple when it was built by Solomon, and if in the structural repairs instituted by Josiah the very copy which had been so placed was discovered, that would satisfy the language of Hilkiah. More important is the statement that first in Deuteronomy was the doctrine of the one sanctuary promulgated, and by implication that this one sanctuary was that in Jerusalem. But in the first place, it is not accurate to maintain that in this pseudo-Mosaic legislation sacrifices are absolutely forbidden to be offered in any other place than the central shrine. In Deuteronomy (xii. 21) it is permitted the worshipper, should he be too far from the

[1] Only a very inconsiderable portion of JE was legislative. The great mass of it was narrative both before and after the "Book of the Covenant." What of legislation there is is not ritual.

chosen sanctuary, if he wished to offer sacrifice, to kill the bullock or sheep of his offering within the gates of his city. When the sacrifice could not be offered at the door of the Tabernacle, the offering would be made most naturally on the local High Place. If it be objected that in the passage referred to the reference is to a private feast; it may be answered that originally a feast and a sacrifice were regarded as nearly synonymous terms, the same thing only looked at from different points of view; thus in 1 Sam. ix. 12, Saul is told that the Prophet Samuel is to be found on his way to the feast on the High Place, and the guests are expected to wait till he came "because he doth bless the sacrifice." Subordinate shrines are thus anticipated in the book of Deuteronomy itself. The discoveries in Assouan and Elephantiné confirm this. The Hebrew community in Upper Egypt, in the days of the later Persian monarchs, believed that they were worshipping JHWH according to the Mosaic Law, although they had erected a temple for themselves. They have no hesitation in appealing to the Jewish High Priest at Jerusalem for his good offices against the oppression of their neighbours, nor have they any feeling that the existence of their temple is derogatory to the dignity of that on Mount Zion. It is to be observed that the community is largely composed of Jews, to whom the supremacy of the Jerusalem Temple would specially appeal. Later, in the days of the Ptolemies, Onias erected a temple to the God of Israel at Leontopolis. When he did so, far from thinking that he transgressed the Law by so doing, he believed that all Jews would welcome what he had done. When the Jerusalem Temple had been desecrated by Antiochus Epiphanes, by his action they should have a shrine in which to worship, one in which the legitimate High Priest ministered.

The clearest evidence of the permission of subordinate shrines in the Deuteronomic Code, is that regulations are laid down in regard to them. With reference to these, it is that the Israelite is commanded (Deut. xvi. 21, 22) "Thou shalt not set up a post (*asherah*) of any kind of wood beside the altar of JHWH thy God, which thou shalt make thee; nor erect an obelisk (*matztzebah*) which JHWH thy God hateth." This cannot refer to any altar or shrine which the

nation as a whole shall set up. All that precedes refers not to national action but to what individual persons or communities ought to do. Although the chapter begins with the celebration of the three great feasts in which it was expected that every male should appear before the Lord, with verse 18 directions are given, not to the nation in mass but to individual communities: "Judges and officers shalt thou make thee in all thy gates, etc." In the verse following the judges so to be appointed are exhorted personally: "Thou shalt not wrest judgment, etc." In verse 20 the people are addressed individually: "That which is altogether just shalt thou follow, that thou mayest live and inherit the land, etc." Then immediately, in that connection, follows the passage in question. It is continued in the opening verse of chapter xvii.: "Thou shalt not sacrifice to JHWH thy God bullock or sheep wherein is blemish." This cannot refer to the general national sacrifices only, but also to what sin-offerings, etc., individual worshippers presented before God. Consequently we must assume that the direction given in the passage under consideration is addressed to a limited village or city community. On any other hypothesis why was this exhortation given at all? If we assume, in accordance with the critical view, that Deuteronomy was composed to meet the tendency to worship in the High Places and induce, indeed compel the people to sacrifice only in Jerusalem in the temple there, this exhortation is scarcely intelligible. That temple and its altars were already old when the book of the Law was found. Did Hilkiah, or whoever composed Deuteronomy, contemplate the possibility of Josiah setting up either *asherah* or *matztzebah* within the courts of the temple? Deuteronomy thus regulated the concomitants of worship in the local shrines. There certainly were no *asheroth* about the temple, although a plausible case might be made out for regarding Jachin and Boaz, the two brazen pillars in the temple court, as æsthetically representing the *matztzeboth* of the Canaanite shrines. The regulations just noted referred to the commands in Exod. xx. 24, 25, which like the passage before us contemplates a multiplicity of altars. "An altar of earth shalt thou make unto me, and shalt

sacrifice thereon thy burnt-offerings . . . and if thou wilt make me an altar of stone, thou shalt not build it of hewn stone;" beside such an altar the Israelite was to set up neither *asherah* nor *matztzebah*. What the Law regulates it allows.

By the reigning hypothesis it is assumed that according to the Deuteronomic prophets the temple on Mount Zion is the one and only shrine in which sacrifice is to be offered. On this assumption it is singular that there is no reference, direct or indirect, to Jerusalem. Had Deuteronomy been composed, as is alleged, with the intention of enjoining worship on Mount Zion, and on it alone, it might have been expected that the writer would have indicated clearly the place intended, if he did not, as did the Samaritan interpolator with Mount Gerizim, directly name it. The Psalmists had no diffidence in asserting that "JHWH loveth the gates of Zion more than all the dwellings of Jacob." "JHWH hath chosen Zion, He hath desired it for His habitation." Why did this Jew, when his aim was to make Zion the one sanctuary, hesitate to point it out? It is not from his dramatic instinct keeping him back from assuming that Moses knew anything of the places to the west of Jordan, for the writer does not feel himself hindered from representing Moses naming Ebal and Gerizim; "Thou shalt put the blessing on Mount Gerizim, and the curse upon Mount Ebal" (Deut. xi. 29). When the command is given to record "all the words of this Law" on the stones which were to be "plastered with plaster," the writer does not hesitate to say that these stones were to be set up "in Mount Ebal" (Deut. xxvii. 4). All this suggests that when this book was written, whoever was the author, the place of the central shrine was not fixed; it was still "the place which the Lord thy God shall choose" (Deut. xii. 5; xv. 20; xviii. 6, etc.). It was recognised that the *beni Israel* should maintain their national unity, if they were to fulfil their function in the evolution of religion, and further that the most natural way to do so was to have one great national altar, the sacred hearth of the nation, with its accompanying shrine; yet the place best suited for this had not been determined.

Were it not that it would render the action of David and Solomon in choosing Zion as their temple to JHWH unintelligible, as well as the action of Jeroboam and his successors in the Northern Kingdom, a case might be made out for maintaining that the designation of Gerizim as the place chosen, instead of being, as generally believed, an interpolation, was part of the original text. In the face of a direct precept like that found in the Samaritan Recension, a man of David's piety would not have consecrated the top of Mount Zion for the future sanctuary; nor would Solomon have built the temple there. But even had they been capable of this, Jeroboam would certainly have embraced the opportunity of getting Divine sanction for his revolt, and naturally would have concentrated worship in the shrine on Mount Gerizim, which had been named by God by the mouth of Moses, instead of setting up Holy Places in Bethel and Dan. This applies to all the dynasties which succeeded that of Jeroboam. The original text therefore can have contained no distinct designation of Gerizim or any other site as the place which JHWH "had chosen to put his name there."

What then was the worship on the High Places?

It was the worship of JHWH; it was totally distinct from the worship of false gods. It is said of Ahab (1 Kings xvi. 31) "As if it had been a light thing to walk in the sins of Jeroboam the son of Nebat . . . he went and served Baal and worshipped him." It has been already shown that there must have been at one time something like an identification of Baal and JHWH; yet notwithstanding it is a heinous addition to Ahab's guilt that he worshipped Baal. As to the kings of David's House, it was regarded only as a slight abatement of the eulogy that they "did right in the sight of the Lord" that the "High Places" were not taken away; thus "the High Places were not removed; nevertheless Asa's heart was perfect with the Lord all his days" (1 Kings xv. 14). Very different are the terms in which Manasseh is denounced. "He reared altars for Baal, and made an *asherah*, as did Ahab, King of Israel, and worshipped all the host of Heaven" (2 Kings xxi. 3). When the priest or priests have been sent from Esar-

haddon to "teach them (the colonists) the manner of the God of the land" (2 Kings xvii. 27), it would be the worship of the High Places that they taught; yet the writer of the book of Kings gives no indication that he regarded the teaching as ritually defective. He assumes that those who had been "brought from Babylon, from Cuthah, and from Hamath, etc.," had been truly instructed in the way to worship aright the God of Israel, but that alongside of this they continued the false worship which they had brought with them from Mesopotamia. It is in perfect harmony with this, that when they claim to be allowed to join the Jews in the erection of the temple at Jerusalem, on the ground that for more than a century and a half they have worshipped JHWH (Ezra iv. 2), their claim is refused; it is not denied that they have done so, but it is maintained that only to the Jews was permission given to build "the temple to JHWH, God of Israel." Again, while the prophets Hosea and Amos rebuke Northern Israel for worship of other gods, and for worship at the High Places, it is as different things. Judah is warned, "Come ye not to Gilgal, neither go ye up to Bethaven (Bethel), nor swear JHWH liveth" (Hosea iv. 15); a warning which assumes at once that this worship was wrong, and that it was a worship offered to JHWH. Earlier a little even than this, the Prophet Amos rebukes the Northern Israelites for breaches of ritual order, in terms which imply that they knew and professed to follow the Priestly Code (Amos iv. 4, 5). The worship of the Ephraimite tribes was really a worship of JHWH, although it was at the same time a worship on the High Places.

While from general considerations the conclusion above stated has been arrived at, the special nature of the worship has also to be considered. The most glaring difference in the worship of Northern Israel from that of Judea was the introduction of the "golden calves" which Jeroboam set up in Bethel and in Dan. This question is one of no little difficulty; what was the precise import of the worship of the calves? It has been supposed to be a transference of Apis worship to Israel; that Jeroboam had become enamoured of this worship during his lengthened stay in

Egypt. But against this is the fact that neither in the case of the Bull Apis nor of the Bull Mnevis is there any word of the statue of the bull being worshipped, it is the bull itself that is regarded as the symbol of deity. Another theory which has received a considerable amount of German support is that the "ox" was an accepted symbol of JHWH. The episode of the golden calf in the desert might seem to support this view. In this way Jeroboam was returning to the older mode of worship. If this is correct it would seem that the Mosaic authorship of the decalogue must be abandoned. But all tradition regards him as the author of the "Ten Words." And it seems equally impossible to exclude the second commandment from the ten.[1] If the commandment against idolatry is not due to Moses, what figure of such imposing stature among succeeding Israelites can be imagined—what person of so great authority and influence—as could introduce a precept at once so drastic and so opposed

[1] It has been assumed as incontestable that *Ephod* and *Teraphim* were images, and that their use in worship was regarded as legitimate. In regard to both these assumptions a most interesting article by Professor M'Fadyen appeared in the May (1916) issue of the *Expositor*. He shows conclusively that in every case where the word "ephod" occurs it retains its primary meaning of a garment, a sacerdotal garment certainly, one so connected with worship that clothed in it the wearer was able to give Divine responses. In regard to "ephod," the description in the book of Exodus of that garment as part of the dress of the High Priest is a guide to what an "ephod" was like. Before one would be at liberty to maintain that it was anything else than a garment, at least one passage must be produced in which the word cannot be a garment. The contention is more restricted; it is maintained that it not only does not mean a garment, but that it does mean an image. One of the passages in which the word is supposed to mean an image is 1 Sam. xxi. 9, in which the sword of Goliath is said to be "wrapped in a cloth behind the 'ephod.'" Of course it might mean an image in that connection, but it might also mean half a dozen things besides. Such a sacred garment would have a special place where it was kept, either hanging up or folded away, and behind that place was the sword of Goliath laid. Another passage is Judges viii. 27; Gideon, after getting the earrings of the prey and their purple raiment "made an 'ephod' thereof and put it in his city, in Ophrah." The fact that purple raiment went to the composition of this "ephod" is demonstrative evidence that it was a garment not a statue. The next passage is more [illegible]ague. It is also found in the book of Judges (xvii. 4, 5). Micah [illegible]kes with the money which he had received from his mother "a graven

to every surrounding tendency? The decalogue is attributed to E, an Ephraimite living about 800 B.C. Elijah might have been the legislator so far as personal influence goes, but there is nothing iconoclastic, in the strict sense of the word, about his mission, still less is there anything legislative. But is there a necessity after all to regard the introduction of the "calves" into the worship of JHWH as contradicting the second commandment? Again we may appeal to the history of Romanism. In every Romanist place of worship of any importance on the Continent, or for that matter in Britain or in America, there are statues of the Virgin and the saints; it may be that even with no sense of incongruity the decalogue stands engraved in Latin on the walls of some of these churches. Is there no possibility to find a solution in this case along a line similar to that which enables the Romanist to harmonise his prayers to the saints, and the candles burnt before their images, with the commandment

image and a molten image," and quite separate from them is the "ephod and teraphim." Of course Wellhausen and Kuenen allege interpolations, and Vatke and Bertheau, two narratives united by a redactor; by such hypotheses documentary evidence may be divested of all value. In the following chapter, vv. 14, 17, 18, 20, the same words occur and the same distinction is maintained. In none of the other passages is there even the semblance of evidence for the contention that "ephod" means an image.

There is greater plausibility in the contention that "teraphim" means images; the word is so translated in the Authorised Version in the earliest passage in which it occurs. The incident in Gen. xxxi. 19, 34, throws no light on the form of the "teraphim." As little illuminative in this regard is the passage concerning Micah, save to this extent that the "teraphim" was not an idol, however intimately it might be connected with idol-worship. There is greater appearance of evidence that the "teraphim" had a human form in 1 Sam. xix. 13. Michal took the teraphim and placed it in the bed to make the messengers of her father think that David lay there. Professor M'Fadyen points out that only the bust need have been shown. The theory he favours is that it was a mask which a priest officiating at these High Places wore. A similar use of the mask to that indicated in this hypothesis is found in the West Coast of Africa, where certain secret societies have private sacred rites in which their officials are masked. Hence there is no evidence of generally accepted image-worship to be drawn from the ephod and teraphim, and therefore no proof against the knowledge of the second commandment or of its Mosaic origin.

against image-worship? The Romanist makes a distinction in kind between the worship he offers to these statues and that which he offers to God. Judaism before the time of the introduction of Christianity began to give more prominence to the doctrines concerning angels; but the belief in the existence and activities of angels was already long deep in the secret heart of Israel. It has been asserted that the Jews brought the doctrine of angels with them from Babylon. The Talmudic assertion is that they brought the *names* of the angels from thence. The very earliest documents of the Pentateuch have repeated references to angels. In the case of Jacob's vision, attributed to E, the angels are represented as numerous. The word designating them is מַלְאָכִים *mala'chim*, "messengers"; but in Gen. iii. 24 (attributed to J) another word appears כְּרֻבִים *kerubhim*, "cherubim." With the further evolution of doctrine the functions fulfilled by these spiritual beings became more defined in statement. They were supposed to be intermediaries between God and man. The doctrine was latent in Israel at all times, that God did not speak, even to His chosen people, directly but only through the intermediation of angels. So Stephen in his speech before the Sanhedrin (Acts vii. 53) said that the Jews had received the Law (εἰς διαταγὰς ἀγγέλων) "by the ministration of angels." Similar to this is what Paul says in the Epistle to the Galatians, speaking of the Law, that it was διαταγεὶς δι' ἀγγέλων, "ordained by angels" (Gal. iii. 19). So also the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews speaks of the Law as ὁ δι' ἀγγέλων λαληθεὶς λόγος, "the word spoken by angels" (Heb. ii. 2). Though the mediation of a plurality of angels is not mentioned in the Old Testament, almost all the theophanies appear also to have been really angelophanies. When God appears to Moses in the "burning bush" (Exod. iii. 2) it is said, "the angel of JHWH appeared unto him"; so in the book of Judges of Gideon (vi. 12, *cf.* 14), of Manoah (xiii. 21, *cf.* 22). Another word than *mala'chim* is frequently used in connections which appear to make "angels" the more natural rendering, *i.e.*, אֱלֹהִים *Elohim*, the word usually rendered "God." Especially in the Psalms is this the case. Thus, according to the Authorised Version, in

Psalms viii. 5—a rendering supported by the Septuagint, the Peshitta, the Vulgate, and the Targum. There are, however, other cases where the same word is used and might be rendered in the same way, *e.g.*, Psalms lxxxii. 1; xcvii. 9; cxxxviii. 1. It is to be observed that Jeroboam uses this word when he says in the consecration of the golden calves, "Behold thy gods, O Israel, which brought thee up out of the land of Egypt" (1 Kings xii. 28). A fair case may be made out for regarding his statement as meaning, "these are the intermediaries of God, the angels who led your fathers in the wilderness." If this hypothesis is correct it will explain the comparative mildness of the prophetic denunciations of this idolatry. Elijah did not call for fire from Heaven to split into fragments those idolatrous symbols; nor did bears out of the forest come at the curse of Elisha to devour the priests who ministered before them. It might have been thought that when the Prophet of Judah came to Bethel to rebuke Jeroboam, not only would the altar on which he had been burning incense have been rent (1 Kings xiii. 3) but also that the gilded image itself would have shared in its downfall. It is true it is said that Jeroboam offered sacrifices "unto the calves that he had made" (1 Kings xii. 32); we must, however, remember that the narrative is from a Judæan record and therefore biased. Moreover, there might be differences in the victims sacrificed, or the mode in which they were offered, which would excuse a distinction being made similar to that suggested by the Romanists in regard to the saints. It was a dangerous innovation, but does not seem to have been as fruitful of evil as might have been anticipated. It was a first step towards polytheism, but it was not followed by a second.

No indication is anywhere given as to the precise figure these gilded calves presented. The probability is that "calves" is a name given in contempt; in all likelihood "bulls" would have been more accurately descriptive. This at once suggests on the one side the winged human-headed bulls of Nineveh, and on the other the "cherubim," the winged attendants on Deity in Ezekiel's vision. When they are called "golden," it is not to be understood that the statues of these "bulls" or "calves" were made of solid

gold; there would be a core of wood or stone overlaid with gold. These statues could scarcely be quite identical with the Ninevite winged human-headed bulls, because they were usually in pairs, and were not strictly statues but were really bas-relief; the material whether wood or limestone was too brittle for the legs to bear the body in a free statue. The difficulty would be solved were the bovine figure represented kneeling, in the attitude to be seen in the oxen that form part of the capitals of the columns in Persepolis and Susiana. Figures of bullocks of fine limestone in that attitude were found in excavating the foundation of a building in Sidon about a score of years ago.

The mode in which these "calves" formed part of worship is somewhat doubtful. There has already been reference made to sacrifices being offered by Jeroboam to the calves. In this statement, besides the theological difficulties involved, there is great uncertainty as to the nature of the sacrifices offered, and the ritual observed. A much more difficult passage is that in Hosea xiii. 2*b*, rendered in both English versions, "They say of them, Let the men that sacrifice kiss the calves." It may, however, be translated, "Saying, They who slay men in sacrifice, kiss calves." This is the rendering adopted by Orelli, following the Peshitta, the Vulgate, and Luther. The Septuagint has had a different reading, and therefore gives a different point to the passage: "Sacrifice men, for bullocks fail;" ordinary victims fail of effect, resort to human sacrifice. There are two points to be noted; the victims, and the mode of expressing adoration. That human sacrifice was ever practised in Northern Israel is extremely improbable. While the action of Ahaz in the Southern Kingdom in making "his son pass through the fire" (2 Kings xvi. 3), burning "his children in the fire" (2 Chron. xxviii. 3) makes human sacrifice in the Kingdom of the Ten Tribes not impossible, yet if it were practised in the kingdom of Jeroboam II. the silence of the prophetic historians in regard to it is inexplicable; they say that he "did evil in the sight of the Lord," but this is not particularised as one of the enormities of which he was guilty. With the exception of this obscure passage, there is no indication of such a practice existing in Israel. We should prefer to retain the

more ordinary interpretation, which regards the statement as a ritual regulation addressed to those who would offer sacrifice, "Let them kiss the calves." This brings us to consider "kissing the calves" as an act of adoration. In this, Romanism supplies an analogy; the toe of the bronze statue of St Peter in Rome has almost been kissed away by the osculation of worshippers. While sacrificing to JHWH, the worshipper was required to show honour to the "calves" as representing the angelic intermediaries by whom the Law had been given. Thus the passage before us supports the idea, indicated above, that the "calves" were symbols of subordinate beings to whom a lower form of worship was due.

As to the ordinary ritual worship of the tribes of Northern Israel, the kind of altar, the mode of sacrifice, and the victims offered are made plain, to a certain extent, by Elijah's sacrifice on Mount Carmel. There had been an altar on Mount Carmel, but it had fallen into disrepair owing to neglect. That original altar had conformed to the regulation of Exod. xx. 25; it had been made of unhewn stones as it is of such that Elijah rebuilds it. Probably the further condition had been evolved in the generations which had passed, that it should be constructed of twelve stones, "according to the number of the sons of Jacob." The victim, a bullock, indicates that the animals sacrificed were those designated to this service by the Levitical Law. The most striking abnormality is that Elijah acts as sacrificing priest; there is no hint that he belongs to the tribe of Levi. On the other hand, we do not know to what extent the inspired prophet might supersede the priest; the prophet could depose kings, it might seem a slight matter to supersede Levitical priests; further the priesthood of the High Places might not be regarded as subject to such strict regulations as was that of the central shrine. It is further clear that the victim was burnt, it was a whole burnt sacrifice. Another peculiarity is to be noted; this sacrifice takes place at the time when the *minḥah* was offered. A meat-offering or *minḥah* accompanied the lamb offered every morning and evening. As a note of time it is used by Ezra (ix. 4); he was astonied "until the evening sacrifice" עַד לְמִנְחַת הָעֶרֶב

'ad leminḥath ha'arebh. From this it would appear that the evening sacrifice was so regular among the Northern tribes that they calculated time by it; probably morning sacrifice was as well established. This would mean that on all the High Places actually in use, every morning and evening would rise the smoke of the offering.

There is yet another source of information, the prophecy of Amos. Although a native of the Southern Kingdom, the mission of Amos was to the Israelites of the northern portion of Palestine. He denounces the various sins and shortcomings of the inhabitants, of rulers and ruled, of priests and people. In one special passage he denounces their shortcomings in the matter of worship. After a severe rebuke of the wives of the rulers of the nation (Amos iv. 1), whom he calls "Kine of Bashan that are in the mountain of Samaria, which oppress the poor, which crush the needy, who say to their lords, 'Bring and let us drink,'" and a denunciation of the judgment of God on them, the prophet proceeds to take up matters of religion, as if these transgressors or their husbands wished to compound for their sins. He declares that though they visit the shrines for worship they transgress. Whether it means that it was transgression even to sacrifice there, or whether it is that when in Bethel or at Gilgal they transgressed, as seems to suit the connection, does not matter for the present purpose, which is to ascertain what their worship actually was.

The first description of their worship is that they "bring sacrifices every morning." In this they were in agreement with the Southern Israelites; in Jerusalem morning by morning a lamb was sacrificed. If that is what is referred to, then this merely completes the evidence afforded by the narrative of Elijah's sacrifice at Carmel, which was timed by the hour of the evening sacrifice. There is this difference, however, in Elijah's sacrifice at Carmel the mention is not of an offering in which victims were slain, but to the unbloody "meat-offering"; still as in the "evening sacrifice" a lamb was slain and offered on the altar along with an appropriate *minḥah*, "meat-offering," the difference cannot be reckoned of importance. In that case the meaning would be that despite their oppression of the poor, they maintained

an elaborate system of daily sacrifices. There is a point to be noted, however, the lamb of the morning sacrifice was called *'olah*, "a whole burnt-offering"; but this is *zebaḥ*, "a sacrifice," which after being consecrated and slain was used for food; they changed what was a daily confession of sin and prayer for pardon into a feast. In any case there is implied an identity of the sacrificial ritual of Samaria with that of Jerusalem. The next element of rebuke is more difficult to understand: "bring . . . your tithes after three days." Whatever the force of this, it is clear that the Samaritans under Jeroboam II. did obey the law of tithes. There is less difficulty as to the sense of the next clause; Amos accuses them of offering "a sacrifice of thanksgiving with leaven." This clause is technical, and to be interpreted accordingly. The תּוֹדָה *todah*, "thank-offering," was fundamentally the same as the "trespass-offering," but in addition there were to be offered "unleavened cakes mingled with oil, and unleavened wafers anointed with oil, and cakes mingled with oil, of fine flour, fried," and besides this, leavened bread was to be offered (Lev. vii. 12, 13). It might seem that there was nothing irregular in all this; but again a technical word comes in, קַטֵּר *qiṭṭeer*, "to burn incense," but nothing leavened was to be burned. The connection suggests that the Samaritans introduced this as an improvement on the legal method. According to what was enjoined in the Law, while the unleavened cakes were placed upon the altar, but not burnt, the leavened cakes were not even offered on the altar, but one was given to the offering priest; the rest were eaten at the sacrificial meal (Keil, *Minor Prophets*, i. 271, Eng. trans.). The last characteristic which Amos brings up for condemnation is that the Samaritans "proclaim freewill offerings and publish them." The idea seems to be that the worshippers were called upon to offer "freewill offerings" (נְדָבוֹת *nedaboth*), and when they had come forward, their liberality was made known by public proclamation. As a sacrifice meant a feast, the public proclamation probably meant a public invitation to it. The principal point, however, which has to be considered is the fact that the technical word is used, which shows that the

prophet expected that the Northern tribes not only had the same religious ideas, but expressed them in the same technical language. In the following chapter, vv. 21, 22, more technical terms connected with ritual occur. JHWH declares, "I despise your feast days (חַגֵּיכֶם *ḥaggèchem*) and I will not smell in your solemn assemblies (עֲצָרֹתֵיכֶם *'atztzerothechem*)." In the following verse He declares He will not receive their "burnt-offerings" (עֹלוֹת *'oloth*), "meat-offerings (מִנְחֹתֵיכֶם *minḥothechem*), peace-offerings (שֶׁלֶם *shelem* (sing.)). It is to be observed that all these terms occur in P, and one of them, *minḥah*, in P alone, in the technical sense. What has to be noted is, that a man who has no connection with either the priesthood or the schools of the prophets, not only himself knows all these technical terms but expects his audience of the Ephraimite tribes to be equally well acquainted with them. All these technical terms to which we have referred, belonged to the worship of JHWH in the highly organised form in which it is recorded in those portions of the Pentateuch designated by P. As conclusive evidence that the worship of the High Places, as found in Israel of the North, was worship of JHWH, one has only to turn as already noted, to Hosea iv. 15*b*, "Come ye not to Gilgal, neither go ye up to Beth-aven (Bethel), nor swear, the Lord (JHWH) liveth"; in these Northern shrines, Gilgal and Bethel, it was the custom to swear by JHWH.

Another part of sacrificial worship was the burning of incense. The composition of the aromatic powder to be burned was somewhat elaborate; it was regarded as sacred, any use of it for ordinary purposes was looked upon as sacrilege, any imitation of it was forbidden. Night and morning was the incense burned before JHWH in the temple at Jerusalem. This was part of the worship on the High Places when that ritual became systematised, as is seen by the fact that Jeroboam "stood by the altar to burn incense" when the "Man of God out of Judah" (1 Kings xiii. 1) came to rebuke him and denounce Divine vengeance on his shrines. It is to be observed that in Bethel as at Jerusalem there is an Altar of Incense; in Egyptian wall-paintings incense is offered to Deity in a spoon-like censer, or in a cup-like vessel

either held in the hand or presented on those spoons already mentioned; no altar appears to be used. Incense burning does not seem to be so prominent in Assyrian worship, if one may judge from the monuments. It is clear, then, that Jeroboam, even while breaking away from the established modes of worship, wished to retain the most obvious features, so that the extent of the breach might be minimised. Jeroboam, however, assumed to himself this part of the priest's office, to burn incense; the sin of Uzziah in later days (2 Chron. xxvi. 16) would seem to indicate a tendency in monarchs at that time to claim this priestly function as part of the royal prerogative.

As worship involves not only a consecrated place, consecrated offerings, and consecrated actions and language but also consecrated persons, the singular institution of the Nazirites has to be noticed. Priests were always consecrated personages, but the Nazirite was not consecrated as was the priest for the performance of any special office; he rather was himself like a consecrated sacrifice. The Law of the Nazirite is elaborately laid down in Num. vi. 1-21, a passage attributed to P. The existence of the order is assumed in the book of Judges (xiii. 14; xvi. 17), and also in Amos (ii. 11, 12). The first two of these passages, those in Judges, are connected with the history of Samson. The part of Amos in which the reference to them occurs is directed against the sins of Israel, by which the Northern tribes are meant. While the institution then was well known in Israel, it was also extant in Judah, as is seen in Lam. iv. 7: "Her (Jerusalem's) Nazirites were purer than snow, they were whiter than milk, they were more ruddy in body than rubies, etc." The order of Nazirites was common to both North and South.

To sum up the foregoing argument; the Northern tribes retained not only the worship of JHWH, but also to a great extent all the ordinances of worship to be found in the Southern Kingdom. There are two prominent points of difference, one negative, the want of a central shrine; the other positive, the golden calves. Set up by Jeroboam in Bethel and Dan, they seem to have been erected elsewhere also; at all events, it seems most natural to regard

"Samaria" in Hosea viii. 5, 6, as referring to the city, not the province. If we are correct in our opinion, the worship given to "calves" was lower in kind than that given to JHWH; they were the instruments of His will, His angels. The Ephraimite tribes had thus the Law in all its completeness, at latest when Amos issued his warnings to them.

In the argument just concluded it will be seen that we have assumed, for the sake of broadening the discussion, the correctness of the critical position, that Northern Israel worshipped only by the High Places. We have not considered the alternative possibility, that pious Israelites continued to visit Jerusalem and worship at its temple. Yet to the attentive reader the books of Kings and Hosea show not a few evidences of the existence of such a tendency. The purpose Jeroboam had in setting up the Golden Calves was to wean the people from this habit, lest the religious precedence given to the City of David might lead to the re-establishment of the Davidic dynasty in the Northern tribes (1 Kings xii. 26-31). This purpose does not seem to have been completely achieved, as Baasha appears to have found himself obliged to adopt more forcible measures (1 Kings xv. 17; *cf.* 2 Chron. xv. 9, 10). An indication of the same tendency may be seen in the reign of Jehoshaphat (2 Chron. xix. 4). Even when the Northern Kingdom is most flourishing, under Jeroboam II., Hosea regards the worship on Mount Zion as that which alone is legitimate (Hosea iv. 15; x. 11; xi. 12); with him the House of David are the Lord's Anointed (Hosea iii. 5). The attitude which Elisha assumes to Jehoshaphat, as compared with that to Jehoram, in the expedition against Moab, confirms this (2 Kings iii. 14). Unless the prophets and others of the pious of Ephraim and Manasseh were in the habit of worshipping on Mount Zion, the high esteem in which Elijah is held among the Jews is inexplicable. This unity in worship will explain also the preservation by them of the books, historic and other, of the Northern prophets. For further discussion of this subject, see Chapter XII., p. 383.

CHAPTER IV

PROPHETISM IN NORTHERN ISRAEL

THE belief in Deity is wide as the race; the cases in which it has been alleged that certain races are totally without the idea of a god have been discovered to be due to defective observation on the one side, and on the other to the instinctive reticence of the savage in presence of possible ridicule. Very various, and in most cases very vague are the ideas entertained as to the nature and attributes of the god or gods, but under whatever disguise the belief is there. There is generally present as a supplementary belief the assumption that the Deity can, and ought to be approached with acts of worship, mainly some form of sacrifice. As universal is the belief that Deity can in turn reveal Himself to his worshipper. In short, in all races there is the assumption, to use the words of the Apostle James, that if "we draw nigh to God He will draw nigh to us"; if the worshipper approached Deity with sacrifices and offerings, He in turn would draw near to His worshipper in revelations of His will. Hence we find in every country that over against the priest, with his knowledge of the ritual of worship that would be acceptable to Deity, stands the prophet, with his claim of being able to find out and communicate the will of Deity, and incidentally the future, whether as dependent on the will of the deities, or as known by him from his superior powers and opportunities though hidden from men. The prophet might assume the guise of a medicine man, or a wizard, or haruspex. Sometimes the same individual was at once prophet and priest. After the victim was slain, he might profess to tell from its entrails what the will of the Deity was, or as at Delphi might pass into a chamber, and there come directly under the

influence of the Deity, and thus be able to express in words what the god willed. In these cases, although the person was the same, the function was distinct. Another method of Divine revelation which was not restricted to officials, whether priests or prophets, was dreams; here the prophet appeared in the guise of the interpreter of dreams.

It will be seen that prophecy in Israel was no isolated phenomenon, but that in this, as in the possession of priests, Israel was on all fours with other peoples. At the same time, no one can fail to recognise how immeasurably the Hebrew prophets excel in spiritual and moral purpose all the augurs, haruspices, and diviners of antiquity, still more the medicine man of modern heathenism. The question now presses: Is the Hebrew prophet an evolution from the medicine man, or is he a survival from a purer day, and the medicine man a degeneration from the prophet? The most commonly held view is the former. This question cannot be absolutely determined, as history does not reach back to the origin of institutions. If the commonly held view is correct, it would necessarily follow that the earlier the notices of the prophets, the closer would be their resemblance to the medicine man. As the present investigation has to do with Israel and prophecy within that nation, inquiry may be restricted to the phenomena presented by it. Abraham is called a prophet (Gen. xx. 7); he certainly is never represented as resorting to incantation to gain a knowledge of the will of God, nor is he represented as invoking Divine direction by lot, a mode of learning the Divine will afterwards so common. It may be observed that the narrative in which Abraham is thus designated is attributed to E, the Ephraimite document. Moses is also a prophet, indeed the greatest of the prophets (Deut. xxxiv. 10); it is never related of him that he used enchantments. In Num. xii. 6, which is claimed for the Ephraimite document, the ordinary method by which JHWH revealed Himself is stated; "If there be a prophet among you I, JHWH, will make myself known unto him in a vision, and in a dream will I speak with him." There is no word in this of anything approaching incantations to prepare for receiving a revelation, still less is there any

idea of wresting a revelation from the Almighty by donning a special dress, or going through any performances with pebbles, bones, or shells. So, too, with Samuel, he has not to go through any process to wrest from God the secret of whom He purposes to set up as king; God reveals it to him that the youth whom JHWH has chosen will come to him; and when he does come God informs him of the fact. Though Saul's servant expects that "the Man of God" will be able and willing to tell them about the strayed asses, he says nothing to intimate that he expects the revelation even on that trivial matter would be given as the result of an incantation. In regard to none of the prophets of Israel is there any indication that the prophet used any other means than prayer to get a Divine revelation. Most frequently the revelation came to them without any wish of theirs; Jonah indeed fled from the presence of JHWH to escape declaring the message God had given him. The only trace of any affinity of the prophet with the medicine man and his methods is in regard to Balaam. It is said of him (Num. xxiv. 1): "He went not as at other times to seek enchantments," implying that he on the previous occasions had done so. He is a degenerate, who though in a way believing in JHWH, yet thought He might be bribed by offerings or cajoled by enchantments to curse Israel. It does not occur to him, as it would to a Hebrew prophet, to call upon Balak and the Moabites "to break off their sins by righteousness," to give up the hideously impure rites of their worship. He recognises all the while that it is righteousness and purity that gain the favour of God, hence his advice to put temptation in the way of Israel that the people may sink to the Moabite level and lose Divine favour. It may then be regarded as clear that, whatever the case with other races, the Israelite prophet was not evolved from the medicine man.

The function of the heathen prophet, as of the medicine man of the savage, is in the case of plague or distress of any kind to inform the worshipper what sacrifices he must offer to propitiate deity so that the evil shall depart from him. He and the priest are thus closely allied. In the religion of Israel they occupied a clearly contrasted position.

While the signs that guided the augur told what enterprises might be engaged in with hope of a prosperous issue, what days were lucky and what days unlucky, there was nothing moral in it all; to the Hebrew prophet the moral was everything. When distress of any kind visited a people, the prophet pointed out the moral reason for it, and required a moral not a ritual remedy. At the same time there is no antagonism between the prophet and the legitimate priest. In the Southern Kingdom, while the people are sternly rebuked for trusting in ritual as a means of pleasing God rather than in rectitude, there is yet no opposition between the two orders. Of the three most voluminous prophets, two are priests, Jeremiah and Ezekiel; the third, Isaiah, though he denounces all trust in ritual, and demands "To what purpose is the multitude of your sacrifices to me?" (Is. i. 11), yet when he has to choose "faithful witnesses" one of the two is declared to be a priest, and the other has a name that was a popular one with the priesthood (Is. viii. 2). Not that there is not denunciation of the priests and abundance of it, but the prophets share in the condemnation. Isaiah not only declares that the priests but also that the prophets "err through strong drink" (Is. xxviii. 7); further he condemns "the prophet that teacheth lies" (ix. 15). Jeremiah, priest though he is, denounces with fierce frequency the sins of the priests, yet with unvarying regularity unites the prophets with them in his condemnation (ii. 8; vi. 13; xiii. 13; xiv. 18; xxiii. 11, and other passages); consequently both classes unite in opposing Jeremiah, and in endeavouring to compass his death (xxvi. 7-11). So far from the prophets being in opposition to the priests, Jeremiah declares "The prophets prophesy falsely and the priests bear rule by their means"; indeed of the two the prophets were the more guilty. So too Ezekiel, though with less frequency and vehemence, if he declares that "the priests have violated the Law," he has already asserted that "there is a conspiracy of the prophets" (Ezek. xxii. 25, 26). In the minor prophets, too, both prophets and priests are condemned. Micah, the contemporary of Isaiah, condemns both classes for their love of money: "The priests teach for hire and the prophets

divine for money" (Micah iii. 11). Zephaniah, the contemporary of Jeremiah, while he denounces the priests because they "have polluted the sanctuary, they have done violence to the Law," also declares the prophets to be "light and treacherous persons" (Zeph. iii. 4).

On the other hand, by the prophets of the Southern Kingdom the priests are frequently directly or by implication highly commended. In the second Isaiah, it is represented as one of the crowning glories of restored Israel that they "shall be named the priests of the Lord" (lxi. 6); and further that JHWH shall say, "I will also take of them for priests and for Levites (lxvi. 21). Jeremiah in showing forth the blessings that shall accompany the restoration of Judah declares, "I will satiate the soul of the priests with fatness, and my people shall be satisfied with my goodness, saith the Lord" (Jer. xxxi. 14). The latter chapters of the prophecies of Ezekiel are occupied with ritual arrangements, the form of the renewed temple and the duties and privileges of the priests in connection with it. Joel calls the priests "the Lord's ministers," declares that they mourn on account of the desolation wrought by the plague of locusts, but gives no hint that any shortcoming of theirs had in any special way been the occasion of it. In the prophecies of Haggai and Zechariah, the priests, and above all the High Priest, are specially honoured. So far then as the Southern Kingdom is concerned, there is no antagonism between the two classes, prophets and priests.

In the Northern Kingdom, the prophets seem to have drawn to themselves all that was properly religious—assuming even what were correctly speaking priestly functions. On Carmel, when putting to the test the right of JHWH to the worship of Israel, Elijah utterly ignores the priests, whether of the schismatic High Places or of the legitimate shrine at Jerusalem, and himself assumes the function of sacrificing priest. It may certainly be urged that all the circumstances were exceptional, and that in such a case that might be done in regard to sacrifices which would not have been thought of in a normal state of matters. Certainly earlier in the history of Israel, Samuel repeatedly offers sacrifices himself; further when Saul, on account of Samuel's delay, takes upon himself

at Gilgal to offer sacrifice Samuel blames him and announces that in consequence his rule over Israel should be merely personal (1 Sam. xiii. 13). The case of Samuel is not quite parallel with that of Elijah, as he was a Kohathite, a member therefore of the same family of Levites as was Aaron (1 Chron. vi. 33-38). It is certainly the case that Elkanah his father is called (1 Sam. i. 1) "an Ephrathite" = Ephraimite; that designation, however, may be held as asserting merely that he was born within the territory of that tribe. Still although he was a Levite, Samuel was not an Aaronite. It seems, however, to have been acknowledged that in abnormal circumstances the Levites might be called upon to perform priestly functions, as in Hezekiah's Passover (2 Chron. xxix. 34). Samuel's assumption of the priest's office appears to have been habitual. When Saul and his servant come to the unnamed city in the land of Zuph, and determine to consult Samuel about the strayed asses, they find that there is to be a sacrifice in the High Place of the city and that Samuel is to be celebrant (1 Sam. ix 12). That he should act as sacrificing priest appears, from the language of the woman at whom Saul had made his inquiry, to be quite the usual practice. Again, when Samuel comes to Bethlehem to anoint David; while the elders of the city are anxious as to the motive that brought him to sacrifice among them they are not surprised that he should come to offer sacrifice. The fact that Samuel was by birth of a family closely related to that of the Aaronites lessens the cogency of any argument from him as to prophetic practice.

What cannot fail to strike the student of the books of Kings, so far as the history of the Northern Kingdom is concerned, is the way in which the prophets ignore the priests. We have already noted the fact of Elijah's supersession of the priesthood on Carmel, but further there is no reference to his ever meeting a priest at all. Elisha equally ignores the priesthood. There must have been numerous priests as there were numerous shrines, but the prophetic activity and the priestly were on different planes. When the age of Amos is reached attention is directed to ritual, and failures in regard to it commented on, as has been shown above. Whether or not it is in consequence of this, the priesthood

will no longer allow itself to be ignored. Amaziah, as representative of the priesthood, challenges Amos for speaking against Bethel, and when he had failed to excite the wrath of King Jeroboam against the prophet endeavours to frighten him away. Amos treats the threats and the accusation with something very like contempt (Amos vii. 10-17), and thereafter pays little attention to Amaziah or his underhand efforts at the court. Hosea who followed Amos treats the priests with little respect; he accuses them of murder and lewdness (vi. 9), declares them to "have been a snare on Mizpah, and a net spread on Mount Tabor" (v. 1). There is, however, one passage (iv. 4) which, on the ordinary interpretation, gives a more favourable impression of the position of the priests—"Thy people are as they that strive with the priest." It is frequently held as meaning "Thy people are utterly regardless, they will even quarrel with the priests." Some have suggested another reading (Sir G. A. Smith, *Min. Proph.*, in loc.), but the meaning does not seem to be more satisfactory. The verses preceding show the evil condition morally into which the people had fallen, and in consequence the judgments of God are manifest. "Therefore shall the land mourn, and every one that dwelleth therein shall languish." Then follows: "Yet let no man strive nor reprove another," all efforts at amending them by reproof will be resultless; "thy people," the followers of the prophets, would be engaged in as fruitless a task as striving with a priest. The priests were so set in their ways and so sure of their ground that they could easily baffle anyone that strove with them. The relation of the prophets to the priests seems to be that of contempt, which generally resulted in the former ignoring the latter.

An interesting line of investigation is the extent to which the influence of the prophets superseded that of the priests in the religious consciousness of the people. While the book of Tobit is late and unhistorical, it may truly represent the way in which some of the pious in Israel maintained the faith by going to Jerusalem; yet it probably would be few who could do so (Tob. i. 6). A case that might seem to support this, is that of the fourscore men that came from Shechem and Shiloh with offerings "to bring them to the

house of the Lord." This, however, only affords evidence of the attitude of the pious in Israel after Josiah had extended his reformation to the territory of the Northern tribes. There is of course the fact that "divers of Asher and Manasseh and of Zebulon humbled themselves and came to Jerusalem" to attend the Passover celebrated by Hezekiah. It must, however, be remembered that they came at the express invitation of the king, and even then were exceptional. Besides these doubtful instances there appear few indications of the Northern tribes regularly honouring the Davidic shrine on Mount Zion with their offerings.

In considering the place assumed by the prophets to the religious community of Northern Palestine, it must be remembered that the references will necessarily be few and incidental. Annalists recording events, having in view only the immediate descendants of their contemporaries, would say nothing about the ordinary and habitual. It is only when something out of the ordinary and therefore deemed worthy of commemoration is connected with the habitual that any notice of it is introduced. A succinct account of the reign of our late king, comparable in length with the narrative of the reigns of Jotham of Jerusalem, for example, or of Jehoahaz of Samaria, would in all probability make no mention of railways or motor cars, unless some disaster connected with these modes of progression had to be referred to. There is a striking passage which indicates that religious dues which, according to the Levitical Law, were paid to the priests, came in the Northern Kingdom to the prophets. In 2 Kings iv. 42, it is said, "There came a man from Baal-Shalisha, and brought the Man of God bread of first-fruits." According to Lev. xxiii. 20, the first-fruits (בִּכּוּר *bikkur*) were the perquisite of the priest; but in this case the man from Baal-Shalisha brings them not to the priest but to the Man of God, the prophet in Gilgal. The incident is introduced merely to bring out the miracle which Elisha wrought, which made the "twenty loaves of barley and ears of corn" provision for "a hundred men." We may deduce from the purely incidental way in which it is narrated that it was no isolated or out-of-the-way action on the part of the man who brought the first-fruits, but was an instance of a

common practice. Although there is no evidence to support it, yet analogy would suggest that much of the tithe went to the support of the schools of the prophets. There might in short be something of the rivalry between the priests and Levites on one side and the prophetic communities on the other that existed in the Middle Ages between the Secular Clergy and the preaching Friars.

When the first-fruits were brought to the priest he was to "wave the first-fruits, a wave offering before the Lord"; but there is no reference to this when the man of Baal-Shalisha brought his first-fruits to Elisha; the priestly share in the dedication is unnoticed. It seems further as if there were evidence of a system of non-priestly worship connected with the prophets. The most important reference is purely incidental. When the son of the Shunamite woman died, "She called to her husband and said, Send me, I pray thee, one of the young men and one of the asses, that I may run to the Man of God and come again. And he said, Wherefore wilt thou go to him to-day? (2 Kings iv. 22, 23) it is neither New Moon nor Sabbath." He would have regarded her request as quite natural had it been made on either of these days: hence there is implied that religious people in Northern Palestine had a practice of visiting the prophets of the Lord on New Moon and on the Sabbath, presumably, as these were consecrated days, for some sort of religious service. We have no information as to the nature of this service, but it cannot have been sacrificial, or the Shunamite's husband would have remarked on the absence of a victim. The nature of the worship can only be conjectured. Yet by following out analogies these conjectures may be regarded as having a certain amount of probability. It may be assumed that prayer was an essential part of this prophetic worship, as prayer is a natural part of worship at all times; and as the prophets were men of prayer. When Elisha is about to raise the Shunamite's son, he prays; when his servant is terrified by the sight of the Syrians surrounding Dothan again Elisha prays that his servant's eyes be opened. Further as the primary function of the prophet was exhortation, it is also likely that on the occasion of such a gathering this would not be foregone. When one examines the writings of the

literary prophets, one finds it obvious that all the oracles imply speech to a listening audience, an audience who had come to hear; such an audience, in short, as is implied in the gathering of the pious. If it may be assumed, as is indicated by the structure of the prophecies which have come down, that they were spoken, it is difficult to imagine where an audience could be collected except in a house. For safety all the inhabitants of Palestine were gathered together in towns; and the traffic of the narrow streets of an Eastern town would be seriously interrupted if a speaker collected round him even a dozen auditors. A larger number might be collected in the *suq* or market-place, but there, besides the difficulty of finding a place sufficiently elevated to command the audience, the presence of a number of people not there for business would be even more objectionable than in the streets. When Ezra wished to read the Law publicly he had a pulpit of wood set up from which to address the assembled people (Neh. viii. 4). It is observed that it is in "the broad place that was before the water-gate" that Ezra had gathered them together. There would thus have to be some preparation before an audience could be addressed. The prophet appears to have received those who wished to hear the message of God in a house, presumably his own, as may be seen from Ezek. xxxiii. 30-32. "They speak one to another, every one to his brother, Come, I pray you, and hear what is the word that cometh forth from the Lord. And they come unto thee as the people cometh, and sit before thee as my people, and they hear thy words, but they will not do them: for with their mouth they show much love, but their heart goeth after their covetousness. And lo thou art to them as a very lovely song of one that hath a pleasant voice and can play well on an instrument: for they hear thy words, but they do them not." From this it is clear that it was regarded as the mark of God's people to come and sit before the prophet as pupils before a teacher. If then the pious of the people were accustomed to come to hear the exhortation of the prophets, it would most likely be that they would do so on days when no work could be done, that is to say, on Sabbaths and New Moons.

Although there is no distinct evidence of it, it may be surmised that music formed part of the worship. It is initially probable from the prominence given to music in all worship. In the Chronicler's account of the Dedication of Solomon's Temple, music has a prominent place. "The Levites arrayed in white linen having cymbals, psalteries, and harps . . . and with them a hundred and twenty priests sounding with trumpets" (2 Chron. v. 12). Further, music was supposed to have an effect on the mind of the prophet, rendering him more sensitive to the Divine influence (2 Kings iii. 15). From the incident to which we have just referred, the music would not improbably be partly instrumental.

Another element may have been present. The prophets assume in their audience a knowledge of the Law, both its precepts and its histories. So far as these precepts regarded ritual we have already noted them. The technical terms of ritual would naturally be preserved among the priests, but Amos, in whose prophecies these terms are most found, did not address himself to priests especially. Indeed if Amaziah's may be regarded as a type of the priestly attitude to Amos, it is one of antagonism. By blaming his audience for failure in matters of ritual, and expressing his reproof in technical language, the prophet assumes that they were in a position to know these terms and what they meant. We cannot imagine that reading was by any means a general accomplishment in Northern Palestine. If they could not read, the audience of the prophets must have learned these terms by hearing the Law read.[1]

[1] If the reading of the LXX. is to be adopted, there would be no doubt in the matter. "And they read the Law without, and called for public professions" (Amos iv. 5). This would indicate that it was considered indecorous and savouring of ostentation to read the Law in the street; it was to be read indoors. However, as the question in the rest of the passage is about sacrifices, the Massoretic reading is superior; תּוֹדָה *todah*, "offerings of thanksgiving," is a rare word, and תּוֹרָה *torah*, "the Law," a common one; moreover, קָרָא *qara* means not only "to proclaim" but also "to read"; as there was only one letter which required to be changed to read חוּץ *ḥutz*, "without," instead of חָמֵץ *ḥametz*, "leaven," that would be regarded as a mistake and altered accordingly.

There are more references to the narratives in the Law. It might be said that great general facts, like the Egyptian slavery and the march through the desert, might be conveyed down by tradition. National tradition does not retain memories of events that are dishonouring; the fact that they had been slaves in Egypt was not one on which they could glorify themselves. Had it been left to tradition, the Israelites would have identified themselves with the "Shepherd Kings," and represented themselves as dominating Egypt. The reader need only be referred to the *Book of Jubilees* to see what Jewish imagination can effect in the way of self-glorification; and that, too, despite the records. Yet there is no fact in their past history so frequently referred to by the prophets and Psalmists as Israel's deliverance from the Egyptian bondage. Thus Hosea xi. 1, "I have called my son out of Egypt"; xii. 13, "By a prophet JHWH brought Israel out of Egypt"; ix. 10, "I found Israel like grapes in the wilderness." In Amos the number of the years of the wilderness wanderings is expressly mentioned (v. 25), "Did ye bring unto me sacrifices and offerings in the wilderness forty years, O house of Israel?" In this last case the reference to the wilderness wanderings does not direct attention to anything of which the people might feel pride, rather very much the reverse. If we may regard Psalms lxxx., lxxxi., as Ephraimite in origin, as the avoidance of all mention of Judah or Jerusalem seems to indicate, not only is the deliverance from Egypt referred to, but also the episode of Meribah in which Israel's rebelliousness was peculiarly manifested. It seems unlikely that tradition would retain memories so little to the credit of the people.

But further there are references to special events. In Hosea xii., the leading incidents of the life of the patriarch Jacob are referred to: v. 3*a*, "He took his brother by the heel in the womb" (*cf.* Gen. xxv. 26; vv. 3*b*, 4*a*); "In his manhood he had power with God, yea, he had power over the angel and prevailed" (*cf.* Gen. xxxii. 24-28). In regard to this passage, it has to be noted that the verb שָׂרָה *sarah*, which is translated in Genesis "Thou art a prince," occurs in this passage in Hosea, and is rendered "had power"; this verb is found only in these two passages. Further the

word יָכֹל *yakol*, "to prevail," occurs both in the Genesis narrative and in Hosea's reference to the incident. These resemblances can most easily be explained by regarding Hosea as referring to a written document, the words of which were known. Certainly it is said in Hosea xii. 4*b*, "he wept and made supplication to Him," and there is no word of weeping in the Genesis narrative; yet in the earlier part of this chapter (xxxii. 7-12) there is given Jacob's prayer, which surely has tears at the back of it; at any rate it is without doubt supplication. In the last clause of this verse 4 there seem to be references to the two visits Jacob paid to Bethel: "He found him at Bethel, and there He spake with us;" in the first Jacob was alone, in the next he had his family with him (*cf.* Gen. xxviii. 13-19; xxxv. 10-12). The whole episode of Jacob's residence with Laban is summed up in Hosea xii. 12: "And Jacob fled into the country of Syria, and Israel served for a wife, and for a wife he kept sheep." Hosea thus expected his audience to be thoroughly acquainted with the history of the patriarch whom they claimed as their ancestor, even to the words of the narrative.

Another event in itself very striking and hence, it is to be admitted, likely to be preserved by tradition was the destruction of the cities of the plain. These cities and their overthrow are frequently referred to in the prophets Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel, as well as the two prophets of the Northern tribes to which we have mainly restricted our attention. Though politically divided the two portions of the Israelite nation stood related to each other in regard to religion, as distinct from ritual, much as do America and Britain; hence the prophetic usage in the one kingdom may be regarded as holding with regard to the other also. Hosea (xi. 8) mentions Admah and Zeboim, the two less prominent of these cities. Amos speaks of Sodom and Gomorrah as overthrown of the Lord (Amos iv. 11); and in doing so he uses the verb הָפַךְ *haphak*. This word occurs ninety-five times in Scripture; of these in sixteen it means "overturn" or "overthrow," and seven of these cases refer to "the cities of the plain"; and of their destruction no other word is used. The figure implied may be seen from 2 Kings xxi. 13, "a man wipeth a dish, wiping it, and turning it

upside down (הָפַךְ *haphak*). The narrative of the overthrow does not supply any features that make that figure a specially happy one. Of the numerous Hebrew words meaning "to destroy," that this and this alone should be used implies that it is a stereotyped usage; a usage, the fixity of which can most easily be understood by it having been read in a written narrative. Another incident, the knowledge of which is assumed, is the seduction of Israel to sin by the Midianites and Moabites. Hosea says (ix. 10), "They went to Baal-Peor and separated themselves unto that shame." Micah also refers to what preceded that fall, the intercourse between Balaam and Balak (Micah vi. 5). The audience of the prophets was thus expected to know the historical contents of the Law till the people reached the banks of the Jordan.

The knowledge expected of them is not restricted to the historical narratives in the Torah. Thus there is the promise given to Israel by Hosea (ii. 15, 17), "I will give her . . . the valley of Achor for a door of hope." Here there is reference to the crime of Achan, and the suffering of Israel in consequence until the iniquity was removed by the punishment of the wrong-doer in the valley of Achor. By that execution the valley of Trouble became a door of Hope. A knowledge of the contents of the book of Joshua was thus taken for granted. There is an equally incidental reference to a later event in Hosea x. 9, "O Israel thou hast sinned from the days of Gibeah." This implies a knowledge of the unsavoury episode of the Levite whose concubine was murdered in Gibeah; when all Israel was gathered together to put away the sin, even though it should mean the extinction of one of the tribes of Israel. Another reference to history is interesting from the light it throws on the Messianic hopes of Israel. "Afterward shall the children of Israel return and seek JHWH their God, and David their king" (Hosea iii. 5). The authenticity of this last clause has been impeached but without valid reason. Sir George Adam Smith would be willing to drop "David," but the parallelism requires the proper name here to balance the name JHWH in the clause preceding. After he has been in his grave a couple of centuries and more, David is regarded as the Theocratic King by the pious. This is all the more remarkable from the

contrast in which it stands to the views of David later entertained by the Samaritans, as shall be shown in the sequel. Cognate with this is the passage in Amos quoted by the Apostle James to the Council of Jerusalem, "In that day will I raise up the tabernacle of David that is fallen . . . that they may possess the remnant of Edom, and all the nations which are called by my name" (Amos ix. 11, 12). The glories of the Davidic Kingdom must have been known. The tradition of the Northern Kingdom would not be eager to retain in memory the glory of the founder of the dynasty against which they had rebelled, any more than we might expect Americans to preserve in careful honour the memory of the Hanoverian sovereigns of England.

The above hypothesis is put forth tentatively, and in full recognition of the weakness of each individual strand in the argument, yet with some confidence that cumulatively the force of it is not inconsiderable. In fact the prophetic worship was in all essentials that of the synagogue of later days. This being so an explanation will be to hand for the universal prevalence of synagogue worship among the Israelites in the age succeeding. If five times in every month all the pious of Israel were directly in contact with the prophets, and were open to be imbued with their sentiments, their influence would be incalculable. The religious party in a nation is always one to be taken account of; especially was this the case in Israel. They had fallen to a low ebb when there were only "seven thousand" who had not bowed the knee to Baal, but by the fiery energy of Elijah followed by the more pervasive influence of Elisha they had increased in numbers and in zeal.

What tended to increase the influence of the prophets in the Northern Kingdom of Palestine was the fact that they were united in guilds; or to give them the name usage has made popular, "schools of the prophets." No description of these "guilds" has been preserved, hence their constitution and characteristics must be deduced from the casual references of writers too familiar with them to think of speaking of them in any other way than incidentally. They seem to have originated with the Prophet Samuel. When David flees from Saul and takes refuge with Samuel in

Naioth of Ramah, we see an organised community with a recognised head. This is the impression the reader gets from the narrative: "Saul sent messengers to take David: and when they saw the company of the prophets prophesying, and Samuel standing as head over them" (1 Sam. xix. 20).[1] The "Naioth" appear to have been temporary booths, possibly not unlike the reed dwellings that the Arabs occasionally erect for themselves. A sidelight is thrown on the structure of these "booths" by the incident related in 2 Kings vi. 1-7. A prophetic community found "the place where they dwelt too strait for them," and they determine either to remove *en masse* or to send out a colony. Their first step is to go to the valley of the Jordan to cut down trees. This shows that the buildings intended were wooden. In Palestine at the present time no permanent dwellings are of wood; the lower storey of a house is vaulted, and only the second storey, if there is one, is roofed with wooden beams supporting brushwood overlaid with mud. The trees intended to be cut in this case must have been small, because there are in fact no really large timber trees to be found in the Jordan valley, and the beams they purposed cutting were such as a man could easily carry on his shoulder. These beams would form the posts round which the reeds would be wattled. Not unlikely the interstices would be filled up with mud. These "booths" would form a village, and in the centre of it a hall which would serve as a synagogue. The prophetic community were assembled together under the presidency of Samuel; this implies a meeting-place. It is said that when the messengers of Saul came to Naioth "they saw the company of the prophets prophesying." It is difficult to understand precisely what this means. Graetz thinks that they were chanting and that Samuel acted as choir-

[1] The name given to the residence of these prophets is to be noted, "Naioth in Ramah." Ewald would directly regard this as meaning a school (Ewald, *Hist. of Israel*, iii. 49, Eng. trans.); in this view he has the support of the Targum which translates the term by בֵּית אוּלְפָנָא *Beth Ulphana*, "the house of instruction." Graetz maintains that the "Bama" or High Place of Rama was outside the town and that David fled for refuge to that as an asylum (Graetz, *Gesch. der Juden*, i. 203). The probability is it means "booths" as Driver conjectures (Driver, *Sam.* p. 124). Gesenius translates "habitations."

master (Graetz, *Gesch. der Juden*, loc. cit.). Although music seems to have had a peculiar suitability to the exercise of prophetic gifts, one would think there was more meant by prophesying than merely chanting. There appears to have been an element of excitement that proved infectious not only to Saul's messengers but to himself also. Similar phenomena have been frequently manifested in seasons of religious revival.

The position of Samuel "standing as head over them" (1 Sam. xix. 20, R.V.) is a thing to be noted specially. There had been prophets and prophesying before, but now for the first time they were organised with a head over them. If Samuel effected such a change in the constitution of the prophetic order as is implied in the institution of the prophetic "guilds," the prominent place assigned him elsewhere in Scripture is explicable.[1]

Thus in Jer. xv. 1, Samuel is put in the same line with Moses: "Then said the Lord unto me, Though Moses and Samuel stood before me, yet my mind could not be toward this people." Also in Psalms xcix. 6, he is put alongside of Moses and Aaron as representative of the worshippers, while Moses and Aaron were representatives of the priests. "Moses and Aaron among His priests, and Samuel among those that call upon His name." Jeremiah's exaltation of Samuel to the level of Moses, unless his eminence had already been acknowledged, would have produced on Jeremiah's audience the same jar of incongruity that du Maurier's æsthete's coupling of Shakespeare with

[1] The reverse process has been suggested, viz., that the Deuteronomist glorified Samuel through him to glorify the prophetic order, and declared him the founder of the order, and the anointer of the first two kings, but that originally he had been merely the local seer of an obscure town. If he were so obscure an individual why was he chosen as the originator of the prophetic order? Why was the origin of it not carried back to Moses? Wellhausen and Künen reconstruct the history of this period to suit their hypothesis, irrespective of documentary evidence. Higher criticism is the only science (?) which occupies itself with fitting the facts to suit its theories, rather than its theories to suit the facts. When any statement which is found in the documents contradicts the theory, it is promptly ruled out of court and declared to be an interpolation, and ascribed to the Deuteronomist or some other redactor.

Postlethwaite as a poet, or Velasquez with Maudle as a painter, does on a modern. If so, Samuel's memory did not owe its exaltation to the Deuteronomist, who at the earliest, if the critical hypothesis is right as to the origin of Deuteronomy, was a contemporary of Jeremiah. A great deal of the difficulty in understanding the history of Samuel arises from the impossibility which the Western intellect experiences in apprehending the naïve conditions and habits of the primitive East. The head of the Corporation of a fairly sized city in Palestine was accustomed to collect dues in kind from the market women, and stuff the carrots and cucumbers exacted into his capacious garments. One knowing such things as that is less surprised at Saul being prepared to offer Samuel a sixpence for information about the strayed asses, and is less inclined to draw arguments from that as to the obscure position occupied by Samuel.

How far the order of the prophets was organised under Samuel there is no evidence to show. That Samuel knew that a company of prophets would be met by Saul when he came to Bethel, and that they would have with them various instruments, implies a knowledge of probable movements which suggests an organism, the arrangements of which were regulated. Still the knowledge of the presence of the prophets might be given to Saul as an evidence of preternatural clairvoyance, to render credible to him "the matter of the kingdom"; but the word *ḥebhel* translated "company" appears to be a technical use of a word which ordinarily means "a cord," and secondarily "torture," as cords were so frequently used for this purpose, hence all "pain." Another secondary meaning was "a territory," from cords being used to mark off boundaries. Only in the passage which we are considering does it mean "a company"; the use then seems technical, and technical terms imply organisation. The extent to which this organisation was carried there is, as has been already said, no means of knowing. For the period of nearly two centuries which separates the age of Samuel from that of Elijah, though there are many indications of prophetic activity, there is little that can be called evidence of organisation. Nathan and Gad appear as prophets to be in a manner

court officials. In the days of Solomon, although Nathan's ministry continued after the death of David, and Ahijah and Iddo also prophesied then, there is no evidence that these prophets had much influence in the immediate entourage of the king. Indeed Ahijah favoured Jeroboam who rebelled against Rehoboam. At the same time, in second Chronicles, these prophets are represented as the historiographers of the reign of Solomon (2 Chron. ix. 29). When the prophet of Judah came to Bethel to denounce Jeroboam's schismatic worship, we can more easily understand his yielding to the invitation of the old prophet of Bethel despite the Divine command, if the prophetic order were to some extent organised, and the Bethel prophet could give to him of Judah signs by word or attitude that he belonged to the "guild."

When Elijah is about to ascend into Heaven, we have distinct notice of these prophetic communities in terms that indicate that they were well-established institutions. Further, Elijah appears to exercise a certain authority over them. When he has gone up to Heaven in a fiery chariot, the allegiance of the prophetic communities is transferred at once to Elisha. There does not appear to have been any method of election; his close association with Elijah made the acknowledgment of Elisha as his successor something of a foregone conclusion.

There might almost seem to have been something of the nature of a revolution in the prophetic schools during Elijah's lifetime. The four hundred prophets who urged Ahab to go up against the Syrians at Ramoth-Gilead, and promised him victory, seem to have been under the presidency of Zedekiah the son of Chenaanah. They were not Baal-prophets for they prophesied in the name of JHWH; but such men as Micaiah the son of Imlah, and also Elijah himself were apart from this organisation. Such prophets as Elijah and Micaiah may be regarded in the light of non-jurors. The death of Ahab in battle against the Syrians at Ramoth-Gilead, and the practical discomfiture of the armies of Israel and Judah before the troops of Benhadad, when the four hundred courtly prophets had promised the king complete victory in the name of JHWH,

would serve to discredit them and exalt Micaiah and Elijah with those who followed them.

Under Elisha the prophetic "guilds" are seen to be a powerful organised association. The individual communities are numerous; two of them are in close proximity, Gilgal and Jericho; these towns are only some three miles apart. There was another at Bethel a score of miles off. They are large, the community at Jericho can send out from their numbers "fifty strong men" (2 Kings ii. 16); the neighbour community of Gilgal finds its accommodation too scanty for its numbers, and has to send out colonists to found another dwelling-place (2 Kings vi. 1). Like the mediæval monks they appear to have assumed a special dress (Zech. xiii. 4). It might almost seem as if the prophets put some mark on their faces by which it could be seen that they were of the "sons of the prophets," like the Hindu worshippers of Siva and Vishnu. After the battle of Aphek when a prophet comes to rebuke Ahab for his unseasonable leniency, he disguised himself by putting ashes on his face. When he relates his parabolic tale the king does not recognise him for anything else than he pretends to be, an ordinary soldier who has got into trouble with his superior officer, but he "took the ashes away from his face"; then it was that the king "discerned him that he was of the prophets" (1 Kings xx. 41).[1]

It is to be observed that it is not said that Ahab recognised the individual, but that he was of the prophetic order. If there was such a mark, there is no means of fixing what it was. That there is no notice of it elsewhere proves nothing; no one, however many the stories of Indian life he has read, would be able to tell the difference between the distinguishing mark of the worshipper of Siva and that of the worshipper of Vishnu; they are too well known to the writers for them to think of describing them. The "rough garment" which would-be prophets donned, as implied in

[1] So the Authorised Version; the Revised has "disguised himself with his headband over his eyes." The Authorised Version has followed the Vulgate and Luther; the difference does not affect our argument, it only points to the fact that as among the Hindus the distinguishing mark was on the forehead.

the words of Zechariah (xiii. 4), to notify their assumption of the prophet's office, may have been an imitation of Elijah with his girdle of leather. It may be noted that John the Baptist, the last of the prophets, "had his raiment of camel's hair and a leathern girdle about his loins."

The constitution of individual prophetic communities must be considered. Each of these communities appears to have dwelt in a small village. Though in thus dwelling together they resembled the monks of later days, they were not strictly cœnobitic, as they had separate dwellings, each dwelling occupied by a family (2 Kings iv. 5, 6); if one family got into debt it had no claim on the assistance of the rest of the community (iv. 1); they have no community of goods. At the same time they have common meals at which, when he is present, the "president" of the order acts as "house-father," presumably superseding for the time the head of the local community (2 Kings iv. 38). If we are right in the conclusions at which we arrived earlier, the dwellings in which the prophetic families were housed were slight insubstantial buildings, possibly wattle and daub. There would be a larger central building in which the community could assemble for worship, and at all events the male members for the common meal. There is much in all this that resembles the Essene community at Engedi, as described by Josephus (Jos., *B. J.* II. viii. 5); and Philo quoted by Eusebius (*Prep. Evan.* viii. 11; Eng. trans. iv. 219); but in one particular the "schools of the prophets" differed from the Essene community beside the Dead Sea in this that as we have seen above they were not celibate.

The prophetic communities were united into one organisation, the head of which was a person to be considered in the kingdom. He is always attended by a special servant. While Carmel seems to have been his ordinary residence he had also a house in Samaria. Elisha is sometimes to be found in Gilgal sometimes in Dothan. He seems to have made frequent journeys between Carmel and Samaria (2 Kings iv. 9). There is evidence that the organic development was carried yet further. In the account of the famine in Samaria during the siege by Benhadad, it is said: "Elisha sat in his house and the elders sat with him" (2 Kings vi. 32).

These elders could not be the elders of the city; for had these been the elders of the city thus in consultation with the prophet, independent of the king, it would have been regarded as constructive treason. Saul reckoned it evidence of conspiracy against him that Ahimelech had consulted JHWH for David (1 Sam. xxii. 13). It would seem necessary to assume that they were the elders of the prophetic order. The narrative, to which reference has just been made, reveals also something of the place in the political scheme of Northern Israel which the head of the prophets occupied. When Jehoram learns the state of distress to which Samaria is reduced, he first determines to execute the prophet, as if it were his blame that the Syrians were pressing Israel so hard. Then repentant he follows his messenger attended by the lords of his court (2 Kings vii. 2). It was Elisha who engineered the overthrow of the House of Omri, when he sent one of the sons of the prophets to anoint Jehu at Ramoth-Gilead (2 Kings ix. 1-3). When Elisha lay a-dying Joash came to him and declared him to be the "chariot of Israel and the horsemen thereof" (2 Kings xiii. 14).

While the prophetic order occupied such a prominent place in the Kingdom of Samaria, it fills no space at all in the politics of the Davidic Kingdom. There is only the incidental notice in Amos vii. 14 to prove that the "schools of the prophets" even existed in Judea; indeed even that reference may be regarded as doubtful. When Amos says that he has not been in the prophetic schools, he does not necessarily refer to any schools, if such there were, in Judea, since his province as a prophet was the Northern Kingdom and the assailant he is answering belongs to Israel; it may well be that it was the schools in Samaria to which he referred. While individual prophets had great personal influence in the court at Jerusalem, none of them could send a messenger prophet to anoint a claimant to the throne as did Elisha. Both the priesthood and the kingship were more powerful in the South; both king and priest could claim Divine sanction to their authority. The priests were the descendants of Aaron "who was called of God" (Heb. v. 4): the king could claim to be the anointed of JHWH. In the North, the priests had been chosen by Jeroboam "of the

lowest of the people" (1 Kings xii. 31): and of the successive dynasties which flitted across the stage in the Ephraimite Kingdom none remained long enough to enjoy anything of the prestige of the race of David, to whom the pious even of the Kingdom of Israel gave a certain *quasi* allegiance (Hosea iii. 5).

Arguing from analogy, these prophetic communities would not be idle. While like the Essenes the ordinary industries of the cornfield and the vineyard occupied certain of them, it seems likely that they would find literary occupation also. The monks of the Middle Ages afford an analogy; to them we owe the preservation of all our Latin classics. Still more striking is the analogy of the construction of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle by the monks of the various monasteries in England. As has been shown above there is evidence of a mode of worship conducted by the prophets, not unlike that of the later synagogue; further from the knowledge which the literary prophets expected to be familiar to their audience, and from references involving terms that implied the intervention of writing, it seemed probable that reading of the Law was part of this service, and not unlikely portions of the prophetic historical books were read also. Who wrote these books so read? It would seem only in accordance with analogy that it should be the *bne Nabhiim*, "sons of the prophets." As is well known to every one who has any knowledge of the Hebrew Scriptures, the most important of the books classified as historical in the Septuagint, and following it in all modern versions, were by the Jews attributed to the prophets. If the prophets were the historiographers the attribution would be intelligible, but if not, not. In Chronicles the authorities for the various reigns are usually the writings of the successive prophets. Thus the authorities for the history of David are the books of Samuel, Nathan, and Gad (1 Chron. xxix. 29); for that of Solomon, Nathan, Ahijah, and Iddo (2 Chron. ix. 29); Shemaiah and Iddo for the reign of Rehoboam (2 Chron. xii. 15). It might be maintained that the books of Samuel and Kings had no connection with the writings of the prophets quoted, but this is met by 2 Chron. xxxii. 32: "The rest of the acts of Hezekiah, and his goodness, behold, they are written in

the vision of Isaiah the son of Amoz, in the book of the Kings of Judah and Israel." Assuming that this is correct, the account of the reign of Hezekiah given in the book of Kings was written by Isaiah. But there are embodied in the canonical book of Isaiah, four chapters parallel with those in Kings; to a great extent the one is the dittograph of the other.[1]

The consideration of the books so reckoned by the Jews confirms the attribution. Joshua was regarded as a prophet, hence his book was in the Canon. In the book of Judges prophets, men of God, continually intervene. The prophetic character is most observable in the four continuous books called in the Septuagint "the Four Books of Kings"—Samuel and Kings of the Hebrew Bible. The first book of Samuel begins with the birth of the prophet; throughout the book

[1] From this it follows, if the authority of the Chronicler is to be accepted, that, against the practically unanimous judgment of critics, the historical chapters of Isaiah are authentic. The same critical authorities deny the historical value of Chronicles, declaring these books not to have been compiled till after the reign of Alexander the Great because Jaddua, who is alleged by Josephus to have met Alexander, is mentioned in Neh. xii. 11; and Nehemiah is assumed to be part of the book of Chronicles, or to be from the hand of the same author. All the evidence for this vouchsafed by Dr Driver is to say that the author is "to all appearance identical with the Chronicler" (Driver, Introd., *Lit. O. T.*, p. 511). Cornill (Introd., *Can. Books of O. T.*, p. 249) would prove it from the identity of the first verses of Ezra with the last of Chronicles. "Hence the conclusion long ago deduced is that the book of Ezra-Nehemiah is the continuation of Chronicles, and originally formed in conjunction with it one continuous historical work, so that the Chronicler would thus be the final author also of Ezra-Nehemiah." That it is the continuation of Chronicles may be admitted without agreeing to the identity of authorship. The repetition of the last verses of Chronicles in the beginning of Ezra rather points the other way; an author would feel himself under no obligation in continuing a narrative to repeat what he had already written, juxtaposition in the manuscript would be deemed enough. It might, however, occur to a continuator to tack on his work to that which he was continuing by some such device. If that is so, Ezra-Nehemiah might be written a century after Chronicles. Even if the critical assumption be granted, certain names might be added to the priestly genealogy long after the book itself was completed, a possibility which Canon Driver acknowledges (*lib. cit.* p. 512, n. 2), and practically abandons the probative force of these names by adding "the other marks of late composition still remain," but without, however, having the frank-

he is prominent and even after his death he intervenes. In second Samuel, which is occupied with the reign of David, the numerous campaigns of the successful warrior are not narrated with anything like the fulness with which his sin in the matter of Uriah the Hittite, and the rebuke he sustains at the mouth of Nathan the prophet, are recorded; or his sin in numbering the people, and the terrible threefold alternative offered him by God through the Prophet Gad. Prominence of prophetic action is seen very markedly in first and second Kings. Nearly a third of the space of these two books is taken up with events occurring during the reign of the dynasty of Omri. So powerful is that dynasty that to Assyria Jehu, who overthrew it, is regarded as *Jahua pal Khumri*, "Jehu the son of Omri." From the stele of Mesha

ness to omit this clause from his argument. But was Jaddua the contemporary of Alexander? This meeting of the High Priest and Alexander is declared by these same critics to be unhistorical, when evidence is brought from it for the authenticity of Daniel. The sole evidence that it was Jaddua who met Alexander is Josephus, who as is well known drops a whole century from his history at this point, identifying Darius Codomannus with his great-grandfather Darius Nothus. As already mentioned the Talmud relates the same incident (Yoma, 69*a*), but says it was Simeon hatz-Tzaddiq, according to Josephus, the grandson of Jaddua. But further to repeat an historical argument given elsewhere (see pp. 29-30 and 111-112), Jaddua was the nephew of Manasseh whom Nehemiah chased from his presence because he had married the daughter of Sanballat of Samaria. This occurred in 432 B.C. Is it likely, especially when we consider the Jewish custom of early marriage, that a nephew of this Manasseh should a century later be filling the office of High Priest, a dignity that in ordinary circumstances went by primogeniture? There is thus no evidence for the lateness of Chronicles to be deduced from Neh. xii. 11; consequently no suspicion of its historicity can be based on that. Indeed if the canon laid down by Josephus be applied, not only Chronicles but Ezra-Nehemiah would have to be dated long before Alexander: he declares (*Contra Apionem*, i. 8) that only those histories written before the death of Artaxerxes the son of Xerxes were received into the Jewish Canon. That this represents the principle on which the authorities, whoever they were, selected the sacred books may be, if not proved, at least rendered probable, by considering the books included in the Canon and those excluded from it. Although their critical decisions as to date and authorship might be greatly at fault, the rule which Josephus lays down appears to be that which regulated their selection. Hence the evidence of the Chronicles as to the prophetic origin of Kings may be accepted.

of Moab we learn something of the prowess of Omri and his son Ahab, how they had conquered Moab when his father reigned. At the battle of Karkar the Assyrian King, Shalmaneser II., sustains a check from the league of monarchs of whom Ahab of Israel was one. Nothing of all this is told in the books of Kings; they are occupied with what Elijah and Elisha did and said, and the monarchs are taken account of only when their activity crosses the line of that of the prophets. The sin of Ahab in the matter of Naboth's vineyard is more important than the alliance which he made with Benhadad, and the check which Assyria sustained in consequence. Though the dynasty of Jehu lasted twice the number of years that did that of Omri, yet the history of it only occupies half the space in the book of Kings. There are no outstanding prophetic figures round which to collect narratives. To gather the civil history of Israel from the prophetic histories, is like attempting to reconstruct from the pages of Eusebius' *Ecclesiastical History* the political history of the Roman Empire from the death of Augustus to the accession of Constantine.

Although the influence of the prophets was so much greater in the Kingdom of Israel than in that of Judah, yet the Samaritans have not one of the books which owe their origin to the prophets. Though Elijah, whose deeds fill so large a space in the history as recorded in Kings, was a Northern prophet, and his greatness so impressed the Kingdom of Judah that the Jewish people believed that he would precede the Messiah, yet the Samaritans have no worthy traditions of him, or of Elisha (see p. 158). The contents of the prophetic books might, one should have thought, have secured their acceptance among the Samaritans. They speak of Joshua as King Joshua in the late production which goes by the title of "the Samaritan Book of Joshua"; yet the ancient canonical book of Joshua they do not possess. Everything about Joshua was fitted to ensure admiring memory on the part of the Israelites of the North; he was an Ephraimite, he was a successful warrior, and his grave was among them. So obvious have all these things proved, that the Samaritans have had to concoct a book compiled partly from the canonical Joshua and partly from the wild

efforts of Samaritan imagination. If we pass to the book of Judges it is only to find further reasons why the prophetic books should have shared with the Pentateuch the reverence of the Samaritans. The Judges whose prowess is given in most detail are all members of the tribes that were part of the larger Samaria. Barak belonged to Naphtali; his colleague and inspiration, Deborah, "dwelt under the palm-tree in Mount Ephraim" (Judges iv. 4, 5); Gideon belonged to Abiezer in the tribe of Manasseh (vi. 11). It was from Gilead that Jephthah went forth to deliver Israel from the tyranny of the Ammonites (xi. 1). Samson belonged to the tribe of Dan (xiii. 1, 2). The two episodes which form an appendix to the book of Judges are both connected more or less closely with the Ephraimite tribes. Micah, the theft of whose idols by the Danites is the subject of the first of these, "was a man of Mount Ephraim." It was in Mount Ephraim that the Levite sojourned, the murder of whose concubine occasioned the action against Gibeah related in the second of them. The first of these episodes was perpetuated in the memory of the North by the shrine set up in Dan by Jeroboam. And the reference in Hosea already noted shows how the second had impressed the inhabitants of Samaria (Hosea ix. 9). The opening chapters of first Samuel are occupied with transactions which take place in Mount Ephraim and Shiloh. If the rest of that book and second Samuel is occupied with the adventures of David, which mainly took place in Judah, yet the books of Kings are fully more occupied with the history of the Northern Kingdom than with that of the South, except at the end of second Kings when the Northern Kingdom had passed out of existence. It is in these books of Kings that, as already noted, the history of the great prophets of the North, Elijah and Elisha, is narrated. What can be the reason, then, of the Samaritans excluding these books from their Canon, and only retaining the Priestly Book, the Torah?

History, as it seems to us, supplies the answer to this, as it does to many similar problems. When the Assyrians removed all those who would naturally be occasions or centres of rebellion, the prophets would certainly be among those most carefully chosen for deportation. The colonists

would sedulously guard against the advent of any prophets from the South to excite the "natives" to rebellion. Moreover, the Southern prophets never had the influence that those of the North possessed; the schools of the prophets were inconspicuous institutions in Judah, if they existed at all. Isaiah and Micah found their sphere of activity in their own neighbourhood. In the days of Jeremiah the case of Judah occupied the attention of the prophets to the exclusion of everything else. Moreover, during the long reign of Manasseh, the prophets and all that prophecy stood for were thrust into the background. Hence the likelihood of the prophets of Judah filling the blank left in Israel by the deportation of their own prophets is reduced to a minimum. When the colonists desired from Esarhaddon that they be instructed in "the manner of the God of the land," he sent a priest, or priests, to teach them, as the whole idea of worship among the Assyrians was ritual: the prophetic side of the religion of Israel, and above all the prophetic worship, was a thing that would never be thought of by the Assyrian monarch. The prophets and their schools in Palestine would be regarded by the Assyrian government much as an association of Dervishes in Egypt would be looked upon by that of Britain. With the priests would be sent a book of the Law. Esarhaddon and his son Asshurbanipal were diligent collectors of religious formulæ and ritual directions as is seen by the contents of their library. No other books would be sent—the prophetic books, which told of the deeds of the Judges and of the imperial glories of the times of David and Solomon least of all. The antagonism of the Israelite priests to the prophetic order precludes any chance of those sent to teach the correct ritual with which to worship JHWH ever suggesting to their pupils, the colonists, or to the people left in the land that there were other sacred books. This would explain why the Samaritans have none of the historical books, though they contain the narratives of the marvels wrought by Elijah and Elisha, nor the works of the literary prophets, although Hosea, whose prophecy is the first given in the book of the twelve minor prophets, belonged to the North.

The alternative explanation is that Manasseh, to give him the name which Josephus assigns him, only brought the

Torah when he came to Samaria to his father-in-law. There are two theories as to the date at which the son-in-law of Sanballat fled to Samaria; one which accepts the chronology of Josephus with its omission of a century and its confusion of Artaxerxes Longimanus with Artaxerxes Ochus, and Darius Nothus, the son of the former, with Darius Codomannus, the successor of the latter; the other identifies Manasseh with the grandson of Eliashib whom Nehemiah tells us he drove from his presence because of his marriage with the daughter of Sanballat (Neh. xiii. 28). The Assouan papyri prove, as stated above, Chap. II. pp. 29-30, that there was a Sanballat in Samaria contemporary with Nehemiah the cup-bearer of Artaxerxes Longimanus, as appeal is made by the oppressed Israelites in Assouan to the "sons of Sanballat" who have a position of authority in Samaria; this appeal is made in the reign of Darius Nothus, the son and successor of the Artaxerxes of Nehemiah. Although it is not impossible, nor indeed improbable that there was a second Sanballat, grandson of the first, it yet is highly improbable that, after the drastic measures which Nehemiah and Ezra took against those who had married other women than Jewesses, within a century "many of the priests and Levites had entangled themselves in such marriages," and that again a son of the High Priest should have married a daughter of Sanballat of Samaria and, like his uncle, have been driven forth with those who had done like him.

While Josephus (*Ant.* XI. v. 1-5, 7, 8) largely incorporates the narrative of the books of Ezra and Nehemiah, he dates the occurrences under the reign not of Artaxerxes but under that of his father Xerxes, whose invasion of Greece is related by Herodotus. In so doing he comes into conflict with the history of the reign of Xerxes as given by Diodorus Siculus and other authorities. In the seventh year of his reign, according to Josephus, Xerxes commissioned Ezra, apparently from Babylon, to go to Jerusalem for the restoration of the worship of the God of Israel there. But according to Herodotus (ix. 108, 109), Xerxes was either in Sardis, whither he betook himself after his defeat at Salamis, or at Susa, to which capital he proceeded after a delay of eighteen months or two years. His stay in both places was disgraced

with scandalous intrigues. Nehemiah, Josephus says, was cup-bearer to Xerxes, and was sent by him to Jerusalem in his twenty-fifth year; but Xerxes had been assassinated in the twentieth year of his reign. It only emphasizes the blunder to read of the twenty-eighth year of Xerxes.

The narrative of Josephus, besides, does not hang together; Sanballat gets the favour of Alexander (*Ant.* XI. viii. 4), and having permission from him erects the temple on Mount Gerizim. When Alexander goes to Jerusalem immediately after the seven months' siege of Tyre, during the course of which Sanballat had gained over Alexander and joined him with seven thousand of his countrymen, an unexplained change takes place. In connection with this visit Josephus relates the meeting of Alexander with Jaddus (Jaddua) the High Priest, and the favour with which he henceforward regarded the Jews. Then after he had "settled matters in Jerusalem, he led his army to the neighbouring cities. The Samaritans seeing that Alexander had so greatly honoured the Jews determined to profess themselves Jews." Neither the Samaritans nor Alexander seem to be aware of any treaty made by Sanballat, although the seven thousand men are mentioned as present. The truth is, the story related by Josephus is, as far as Jaddua is concerned, not historical.

If the second possible date of Manasseh's migration is assumed other difficulties emerge. It is to be observed that in the Biblical record there is no word of Manasseh's departure to his father-in-law when Nehemiah chases him from his presence, although it is extremely probable. Of course there is no word either that he took the Torah with him, or had any need to do so. According to the ordinarily received critical theory, the Priestly Code had been but recently brought from Babylon by Ezra. In accordance with an overstrict interpretation of this code Manasseh had been deprived of the priesthood, yet on this theory he carries this Priestly Code with him to Samaria. The difficulties in regard to this action of Manasseh we consider elsewhere. If, however, it be assumed that he did convey the Pentateuch to the remnant left from the Assyrians, and to the descendants of the colonists whom the Assyrians had introduced other difficulties emerge. Why did he not take the prophetic

books with him also? He would wish to ingratiate himself with the people among whom he was to make his abode. The book of Joshua, as has been seen above, was one in which the Samaritans who claimed to be Ephraimites would be specially ready to delight, as it recorded the deeds of an Ephraimite through whose prowess and conduct Israel had conquered the Canaanites. The difficulty is not lessened but increased if the critical hypothesis be adopted, according to which the canonical book of Joshua was the result of the same process of compilation and redaction, which it is alleged is seen in the Pentateuch. When he took the five books why did Manasseh leave the sixth, which would be at least as interesting? The motives that would naturally have led to the conveyance of the book of Joshua to Samaria would apply to all the historico-prophetic books, with the exception of the last nine chapters of second Kings. Indeed the omission of the seventeenth chapter of that book might have been enough to bring the whole into harmony with the feelings of Northern Israel; especially if there had been an editorial variation on the monotonous condemnation of the kings of Samaria. There was no antagonism between the priestly and the prophetic orders in Judah then; Haggai and Zechariah, prophets though they were, encouraged Joshua the High Priest in rebuilding the temple and restoring the sacrificial ritual. Manasseh had thus no conceivable subjective motive for excluding the books associated with the prophets; as little could there be any external motive. If Manasseh was able to persuade the Samaritans to abandon their customary rules of sacrificial ritual and adopt the Pentateuchal Law, he would have had small difficulty in getting them further to accept as sacred oracles the whole prophetic literature. On the assumption that Manasseh brought the Law to Samaria, it is impossible to explain why he did not bring also at least the historical books associated with the prophets.

If, however, the Samaritans had, when he came to them, the Pentateuch already, and had sacrificed, as they had claimed in the days of Zerubbabel to JHWH in accordance with its precepts for a couple of centuries and more, but had not, for such reasons as have been indicated above,

admitted the other books, the action of Manasseh can easily be understood. As they had accepted him as High Priest, to the supersession of their own priests, the successors, possibly the descendants, of those sent by Esarhaddon, he for his part was willing to be content with the limited Canon of the Samaritans. It would thus seem that the hypothesis which we have advanced is the only one which will explain the phenomena.

CHAPTER V

THE RITUAL OF SAMARITAN WORSHIP

In a previous chapter it has been shown that the ritual followed by the Northern Israelite tribes, although the sacrifices were offered at the "High Places" by irregular priests, was mainly the same as that in the central shrine in Jerusalem, in which legitimate Aaronite priests officiated. The priests sent by Esarhaddon would doubtless carefully adhere to this ritual. They would have the guidance of the sacred Torah, with which, as we have seen reason to believe the Assyrian authorities would be careful to provide them to keep them right. When, on the fall of the Ninevite Empire Josiah assumed, as Davidic king, the rule over all Israel, it is recorded that "the altar that was at Bethel which Jeroboam the son of Nebat had made he brake down, and burned the High Place, and stamped it small to powder and burned the asherah. And all the houses of the High Places that were in the cities of Samaria which the kings of Israel had made, Josiah took away, and did unto them according to all that he had done in Bethel. And he slew all the priests of the High Places that were there upon the altars" (2 Kings xxiii. 15, 19, 20). It will thus be seen that sacrificial worship upon the High Places had spread over all the land, and priests were attached to each of these local shrines. This must have followed as the result of the teaching of the priests sent by Esarhaddon. To meet this the reformation of worship, which had begun in Jerusalem, Josiah extended over the whole of Palestine. The death of Josiah at Megiddo would tend to throw the sanctity given to Jerusalem into abeyance. The subsequent fall of the city and the destruc-

tion of the temple were fitted to destroy it altogether. The action of the eighty men mentioned in Jeremiah (xli. 5) as bringing, with the signs of mourning, "offerings and incense to the House of JHWH, who had come from Shechem, Samaria, and Shiloh, proves, however, that the belief in a central shrine was not dead. Whether their intention was, as seems most probable, to lay their offerings on the site of the brazen altar amid the ruins of the temple, or if it is maintained as it is by some that Jeremiah had consecrated the High Place of Mizpah to take the place for the time of the ruined temple, it was to the central shrine they brought their gifts, and so still the belief is there.[1] When the society that had gathered round Gedaliah the son of Ahikam was broken up by his murder, the practice would cease. With Ishmael's act of treachery, and the migration to Egypt of the "captains" under Johanan, son of Kareah, all civil government ceased, and so all safety for travellers.

There is no direct evidence to guide the investigator in deciding what form worship took in the province of Samaria during the half century or so that elapsed between the death of Gedaliah and the issuing of the decree of Cyrus, and the coming of Zerubbabel in accordance with it. It probably was a renewal of the worship on the High Places as the "adversaries of Judah and Benjamin"—the colonists sent from Assyria—claim to have sacrificed to JHWH since the days of Esarhaddon. As we have seen reason to believe that these colonists were only a minority, probably a small minority of the inhabitants of Samaria and Galilee, yet as we also saw they probably would be the wealthier and more influential portion of the community; they thus might presume to represent the whole people—the native Israelites as well as themselves. It is to be noted that their worship of JHWH is by sacrifice. Further, and more important for our argument, it is to be noted that by their appeal to be allowed to assist in building the temple at Jerusalem

[1] Mizpah does not seem to have been a High Place of such special eminence that it should be supposed to take the place of the ruined temple. Mizpah was but little out of the way to Jerusalem from Shechem and Shiloh, and the governor was there to whom it was well to be respectful.

they acknowledged that their mode of worship was only to be regarded as a temporary expedient, to cease, or at all events to fall into the background, when the temple on Mount Zion was erected and legitimate sacrifices offered there once more. Though after their destruction by Josiah the High Places had been restored, yet his reform had not been without effect; even while they offered sacrifices and burned incense on the High Places they acknowledged in their hearts that Jerusalem was the place where men ought to worship. Unless we assume some such feeling as this, the action of the Samaritans is unintelligible. There was nothing to hinder them ignoring the Jews and continuing to offer sacrifices on the High Places, according to the teaching of the priests sent by Esarhaddon. Certainly this had been broken in upon by Josiah, but his reign over all Israel had been but short, and they had been obliged to go back to this worship while the Jerusalem Temple lay in ruins. There was nothing to hinder them continuing to sacrifice in the High Places unless the belief that legitimate sacrifices could only be offered on Mount Zion. It would seem that they acknowledged the Deuteronomic Code as binding. We have already seen from the technical language used by Amos that the Israelites of the North knew the Priestly Code as well. Consequently it must have been the whole Torah which was brought by the priests from the east.

It was clearly a later development when the Samaritans came to believe that Mount Gerizim was the place chosen by God for the one national shrine of Israel. It was a further step when this belief was made the distinguishing tenet of Samaritanism. Not impossibly it was Manasseh who first promulgated this doctrine. In Deuteronomy although the Divine purpose that Israel should have one national altar was declared, and the duty of reverencing it was impressed on the people, the choice of the place was at some future time to be made by God. When the choice was to be made, or how the place chosen was to be indicated, was not revealed. It was open to any one to maintain that Gerizim rather than Zion was the place God meant. Certainly the selection of the valley which divided Mount Gerizim from Mount Ebal as the place where the people were

to be assembled—when one half the tribes should stand on the slopes of Gerizim to recite the blessings and the other half on the opposite slopes of Ebal to recite the curses of the Divine Torah—might not unnaturally be supposed to point to one or other of these twin mountains as "the place which the Lord your God shall choose out of all your tribes to put His name there" (Deut. xii. 5). The further fact that on Gerizim was the blessing to be put (xi. 29) would naturally suggest that it, of the two, was that most favoured. The selection of Ebal as the mountain on which the stones with the Law engraved on them were to be set up, seemed to contradict what had preceded, so that the falsification of the record seemed a not unnatural suggestion. That being amended, some bolder *falsarius* introduced the name Gerizim as the place Divinely selected. This interpolation probably occurred not later than the days of Manasseh, not impossibly at his instance as suggested above.

In the interval between the repulse which the Samaritans received from Zerubbabel and the arrival among them of Manasseh, the Samaritans, colonists and natives alike, fell back on the worship of the High Places, and sacrificed on them: a worship without sacrifice would be unintelligible at least to the Assyrian colonists. At the same time there seem to have been proffers of friendship, and manifestations of a willingness on the part of the authorities in Jerusalem to reconsider the action of their predecessors. Nor were there wanting indications of a continued wish on the part of the Samaritans to share in the worship of the Jerusalem temple. Only on this supposition can it be understood how Tobiah, who bore the nickname of "the Ammonite," could have a chamber in the temple itself.[1] The intermarriages between the Samaritans and the priestly caste in Jerusalem confirm the truth of the above suggestion.

With the arrival of Ezra first, and then of Nehemiah in the reign of Artaxerxes, all this friendly intercourse ceased, and the Samaritans were once more excluded, and this time finally, from the temple at Jerusalem. It may be

[1] Nicknames of this kind are not uncommon. We have referred above to the case of Ludovico Sforza, called *Il Moro*, the Moor, because of his complexion, although of pure Italian descent.

that some vague remembrance of this is the reason why Samaritan tradition, as handed down by Abu'l Fatḥ, declares that sacrifices ceased in the reign of Surdi (Artaxerxes), when the Israelites returned from captivity. According to the story of Abu'l Fatḥ, when the Persian King would offer sacrifices on Mount Gerizim, it is revealed that JHWH no longer desires bloody sacrifices, but that henceforth prayer is to be regarded as the only sacrifice acceptable to Him. All this looks like a confused remembrance of the real events. When in the reign of Artaxerxes the final company of returning Jewish exiles under Ezra arrived at Jerusalem, they opposed the Samaritans having access to the temple there. Still more vehement became this opposition when Nehemiah came as governor and backed it up. Of course it was successful, and the Samaritans ceased to be able to offer legitimate sacrifices. Until the temple was erected on Mount Gerizim, and they could transfer their allegiance thither, to the pious Samaritans legitimate sacrifice had ceased. That sacrifice was revived on Mount Gerizim is certain, at all events when Manasseh retired to Samaria, and the temple was erected. Josephus, who relates the flight of Manasseh and the occasion of it, and would have been glad had he been able to record that he never offered sacrifice on the altar in the schismatic temple, does not make such an assertion, implies that Manasseh did act as sacrificing priest. In the time of our Lord, sacrificial worship and burning of incense continued on Mount Gerizim. The Samaritan woman, to repeat what has been already noted, when she says, "Our fathers worshipped in this mountain," implies, from what she adds of the Jewish claim that men ought now to worship in Jerusalem, that the descendants of these Samaritan fathers still sacrificed there (John iv. 20). In the case of the ten lepers cleansed by our Lord (Luke xvii. 11-19), the Samaritan, as well as the nine Jews with him, is told to show himself to the priests, presumably to offer the sacrifices incumbent on the cleansed leper.

At all events sacrifices have now long ceased, possibly the cessation began during the Roman persecutions; certainly they do not seem to have been offered under the Mohammedans. But as already noted elsewhere, Benjamin

of Tudela and Sir John Mandeville assert that in their day the Samaritans offered sacrifice on Mount Gerizim. Against this, as just mentioned, is the statement of Abu'l Fath, that all sacrifices ceased in the Persian period. Though the date is wrong, yet as he wrote in the fourteenth century, the very same century in which Mandeville visited Palestine, and only two centuries after the visit of Benjamin of Tudela, probability is in favour of his view. He was himself a Samaritan, and spoke from within; further, he had no motive to deny that sacrifices were offered, had they been; the evidence of Abu'l Fath must be preferred to that of those European travellers, to this extent at all events, that in his day sacrifices had so long ceased that the occasion of their cessation had passed out of memory.

As with the Jews, so now at all events with the Samaritans, public worship has become entirely that of the synagogue. The contrast between the present conditions of the cognate nationalities is very great. While the Jews have synagogues in every city of importance in the civilised world, the Samaritans now have only one, that in Nablus. Formerly the Samaritans had many more than this one synagogue. Pietro della Valle found synagogues of the Samaritans in Cairo, Gaza, and Damascus, in addition to that in Nablus; others are referred to by other authorities as existing elsewhere. These synagogues have all been destroyed, and the communities that worshipped in them massacred by the Mohammedans; that in Gaza was annihilated only in the first quarter of last century. As has just been said, the one solitary synagogue left to the Samaritans is to be found in the small quarter of the city in which they dwell, a poor despised remnant. The cluster of cramped houses, which form the Samaritan quarter, is situated in the south-west of Nablus, on the slope of the base of Mount Gerizim. In going to the synagogue the visitor passes through a small neglected garden to a stairway much like that by which an ordinary house is reached in those irregularly built Palestinian towns, in which the houses cling to the sides of steep hills. After mounting the stair the visitor enters a small white-washed apartment with a stone floor, which is covered with matting. Dr Mills says

it is 37 feet 5 inches in length; he does not state the breadth, but if his plan has been drawn to scale, that must be about 19 feet. As the synagogue is lighted merely by a small window in the roof, and the visitor has just left the dazzling light of the Syrian sun, his feeling is of obscurity almost amounting to darkness. In ordinary cases the visitor is not permitted to pass much beyond the threshold, but is met by the priest and shown one or two of the manuscripts which they possess. These manuscripts are brought out of a recess called the *muzbaḥ* or altar. As already mentioned, the Samaritans, like the modern Jews, regard prayer as taking the place of the sacrifices formerly offered on the *muzbaḥ* of their temple, so now they offer their prayers towards this representative of the ancient altar. Pendent from the vaulted roof there hangs in front of the sacred altar a veil of white linen damask, on which are sewn pieces of coloured linen cut so as to form a pattern. The synagogue is so planned that the worshippers, in turning their faces to the veiled recess, turn them also towards Mount Gerizim, the *Qiblah* of the Samaritans. As the altar cloth in an Anglican church is changed according to the festival, or the saint, to whom the Sunday is consecrated, so is the veil in the Samaritan synagogue in accordance with their festivals. Behind this veil only the High Priest and the second High Priest are allowed to go. As already indicated, within this recess are preserved the copies of the Torah possessed by the Samaritans. They claim that this *muzbaḥ* is of the exact dimensions of the altar which Moses made. While internally the measurements of the recess are much below the dimensions given in Exodus (xxvii. 1), if the measurements are made externally the discrepancy is not so great. Mysteriously there hang in the synagogue chandeliers, much like those found in Mohammedan mosques; as the Samaritans only visit their synagogue on Sabbath when it is illegal to kindle a light, it is difficult to see what purpose these chandeliers serve.

The ritual observed by the Samaritans in their synagogue worship is in all essential points very much the same as that of the Sephardim, the originally Spanish Jews who came to Palestine fleeing from persecution. Like all Orientals on

entering a sacred place, the Samaritans put off their shoes when they go into their synagogue. They assign as a reason for this action that Moses was commanded to remove the shoes from off his feet "for the place on which thou standest is holy ground." Dr Mills mentions that when the Samaritans enter the synagogue, they put on a religious dress of white calico; these dresses are kept in the synagogue. The Jews use the *Tallith* in a similar way; this the Samaritans do not use. They have three services on the Sabbath; the first on Friday at sunset, when as with the Jews, the Sabbath begins; the next and longest early on Saturday morning; the last on Saturday afternoon, a little before sunset. With *tarbush* on head they sit cross-legged on the ground unless when the sacred name occurs, then they prostrate themselves. When in the reading of the Law certain phrases are pronounced, every one brings his hand down over his face and beard.

The essential part of the service is, with the Samaritans as with the Jews, the reading of the Law. It is divided into portions, analogous to the Jewish *perachoth*, called *qatzin*. These divisions are so arranged that the whole Law is read through in course of a year. It ought to be said that strictly speaking on the Sabbath the priest does not read the passage for the day, but recites it. Dr Mills describes his tone as being harsh and barking; that must have been an individual peculiarity as no other observer has noticed this. Liturgic prayers are also recited to which responses are given. They do not make use of the Psalms, but they have certain hymns sung to weird tunes; to these they attribute great antiquity, declaring that the seventy elders whom Moses appointed each composed a tune. They do not introduce instrumental music into their worship, indeed do not cultivate it, as they usually hire Mohammedan musicians when they have festivals in which they desire such an accompaniment.

Among the Askenazim not only is the synagogue used daily for prayers, but it also becomes something of a club in which the Jews belonging to it meet, some to read, some to talk; each synagogue having a library, more or less extensive, of theological literature. Unless on festivals the Samaritans do not visit their synagogue during the week, except when tourists are conducted to see it.

The Samaritans observe the Sabbath with greater strictness than do the Jews. The Jews have devised various modes of evading the extreme strictness of the legal enactments; of none of which do the Samaritans avail themselves. The Law forbids the kindling of a fire on Sabbath; the Jews employ Gentiles to do this for them, as also to do other things which, conducive to comfort, are forbidden to a Jew. By the device of *erubin*, the Jew can extend the bounds of his house indefinitely, and from these reckon his Sabbath day's journey. The Samaritan's only Sabbath day's journey is from his house to the synagogue. From Friday evening at sunset to the sunset of Saturday, no light is to be seen in any Samaritan dwelling. During that period no work is done, not even opening a letter. They expect the Law to be observed with equal strictness by all within their gates. The Samaritans do not, as do the Jews, introduce the Sabbath by repeating the *Qiddush*, nor close it with the *Habdalah*. As the Rabbinists ascribe the introduction of these ceremonies to the days of Haggai and Zechariah, this, were the authority of the Talmud of any value, would imply that the Samaritans had received not only the Law but the synagogal reading of it before the time of Ezra.

To a nomadic, pastoral people, the phases of the moon were of necessity a matter of special interest and importance. Moonlight meant the need of careful watching against possible marauders, on the one hand, and on the other the opportunity of commodious march, if a change of camp were desired. The reappearance of the faint sickle of light would necessarily be greeted with rejoicing. The festival of New Moon must have been very early celebrated by the Jews, nomads as they originally were. The solemnities enjoined by the Law are to be found in Num. x. 10; xxviii. 11. Singularly, these regulations are attributed to the latest stratum of the Priestly Code. Naturally it might have been expected that a ceremony so very ancient would have been among the first to have its details legally fixed. As it is, the existence of the feast is assumed in the passages which have been referred to as already well known. In 1 Sam. xx. 24, it is the occasion of a family festival at which all the members of the king's household are expected to be present,

and the absence of David a thing to be resented. It is to be observed that ceremonial purity is necessary to taking part in it. When the Shunamite woman, as we have said in a previous chapter (2 Kings iv. 23), wishes to go to Elisha, her husband implies that her desire would have been intelligible had it been New Moon. Ezekiel and both the first and the second Isaiah assume this solemnity as one regularly maintained. Hosea mentions it as a sign of the desolation coming upon Israel that her New Moons would cease (Hos. ii. 11). Amos refers to the New Moon as a religious service of which the ungodly were easily wearied. Blowing of trumpets was an important part of this solemnity. In Psalm lxxxi. 3, the call is made to "Blow up the trumpet in the New Moon." This is the more interesting as this Psalm has originated in the Northern Kingdom; Israel, Jacob, and Joseph are named, but there is no word of Judah or Zion. The celebration of New Moon is retained by the Samaritans but without the blowing of trumpets. Alike under the Christian and Mohammedan rule the Samaritans would find it expedient to make their acts of worship as little conspicuous as possible. Now the whole service is confined to the synagogue. They call the feast *Rosh Hodesh*, "the beginning of the month." Although now the date of the New Moon is fixed astronomically, watchers are appointed who announce when they have seen it. Thereafter on the following afternoon they assemble in the synagogue. The service consists of a recitation of certain prayers and reading of the portions of the Law which bear on the solemnity. During the service the ancient roll of the Law is exhibited for the reverence of the worshippers: the whole service lasts about two hours. The Samaritans regard this festival as set apart specially for the worship of JHWH as the Maker of all things.

To the Samaritans as to the Jews, the most important annual festival is "the Passover." In comparing the Jewish Passover ritual with the Samaritan, it ought to be remembered that the feast of the modern Jews which they call the "Passover" is not, strictly speaking, a celebration of the ancient feast of deliverance, it is rather an observance which keeps that feast in remembrance; in the hope that soon they may keep it in its fulness in Jerusalem. The Samaritans

maintain that they have celebrated the Passover with its true rites from the beginning. It is certainly the case that, with the exception of forty years during which they were debarred from celebrating it on their sacred mountain, they have done so, consequently the Samaritan mode must bear a closer resemblance to the ancient celebration than the Jewish. Yet there are many points in which the Samaritans have diverged from the way the feast was observed in the days of Hezekiah.

One of these points is the mode of reckoning the date on which the Passover is to be held. The Samaritan year, like the Jewish, consists of twelve lunar months, alternately of twenty-nine and thirty days. While in both too great divergence from the solar year is avoided by the introduction of a second *Adar* as an intercalary month, yet, as the Samaritans have not adopted the Metonic cycle, the *Veadar* is not interpolated according to a fixed principle, but by comparison with the Greek Christian Calendar. As a result of this the date of the Samaritan Passover frequently differs from that of the Jews. Sometimes, as in the year 1898 when the present writer saw it, the Samaritan Passover was the later by nearly a calendar month. The method by which the Samaritans fix the date on which they ought to hold the Passover is, according to a communication which the present writer had from the High Priest, stated in the following words: "It is to be held on the evening before the Full Moon of the Greek Nisan." Nisan mainly coincides with our April, but as the Greek Christian Calendar is pre-Gregorian, there is a difference of twelve days between the first of our April and the first of the Greek Nisan; consequently the Samaritan Passover occurs, at the earliest, on the evening before the full moon after 12th April. The result is that there is very considerable difference between the times at which it is celebrated when these are reckoned according to our Western calendars. When Dean Stanley saw it, the feast fell on the 13th April, but when the present writer saw it the date was 5th May. As the Calendar of Meton, which adjusted the relation of the lunar to the solar year by a cycle of nineteen years, dates from 432 B.C. and is adopted by the Jews, its adoption must go back to the Greek period.

Probably they did so early in that period, as in the Maccabæan struggle the years are given according to the Seleucid era and the months have Macedonian names. The Samaritans must then have broken away from the Jews during the Greek period. The Samaritan dependence on the Calendar of the Greek Church must date from the times of the Byzantine emperors, therefore too late to have any bearing on the question of the relative date of the Samaritan schism.

Connected with this is another peculiarity in which the Samaritans differ from the Jews, *i.e.*, the adjustment of the Passover to the Sabbath. With the Jews the Passover Law supersedes that of the Sabbath, with the Samaritans it is the reverse. With the Samaritans should the Passover fall on the Sabbath, then it is celebrated on the preceding day; not at sunset on the Friday, the day before, when according to Eastern reckoning, the Sabbath began, but at midday. This was the case when Dr Mills was present at the observance in 1860. The Jews had an arrangement by which they avoided the Passover occurring on the day preceding the Sabbath. The Samaritan adjustment—it at all events is clear—is quite independent of the Jewish; therefore it must be dated after the separation. Other differences will be considered in connection with the actual observance of the solemnity.

Some day before the 14th Nisan, which has been arranged, as has been said above, to fall on the evening before the full moon of the Greek Nisan, the whole Samaritan community, except those ceremonially unclean, shut up their dwellings in Nablus and ascend Mount Gerizim. They encamp in a cup-like hollow to the west of the mounds that cover the ruins of the ancient Samaritan temple. The tents are arranged approximately in a circle, while apart, separated by a hundred yards or so from the rest, is one solitary tent. What strikes the observer is the dazzling whiteness of the tents. Like the Jews, before Passover, the Samaritans either cleanse specially, or renew most of their domestic utensils; probably the tents share in this cleansing and renewal. The tent pitched apart from the others is so placed that any worshipper becoming mortally ill, may in the article of death be removed thither, by the hands of Moslems, lest the sacred camp should be defiled by the presence of death.

The need for this was seen in the Passover celebration at which the writer had the fortune to be present; a woman whose death seemed imminent was removed to this tent by some Moslems who were there as sight-seers. Her death was not so near as was anticipated, as she was still living on the afternoon of the following day. It is a singular commentary on this practice that the Samaritans assert that no one ever dies on Mount Gerizim, during the stay of the people on it for the Passover.

On the morning of the day preceding the Passover, a trench of some ten or twelve feet long, and a couple of feet broad and deep[1] is dug to the north-east of the encampment; it is filled with brushwood as fuel. Next, a pit which has been lined with stones is opened; into it, too, brushwood is cast. Both are kindled, and throughout the day the fire is kept up, replenished with fuel from time to time. On the trench are placed a couple of caldrons full of water. Between these and the encampment there are laid on the ground a number of thin posts, each with a cross-piece affixed to it near the top. Near these posts is to be seen the group of lambs which are to be sacrificed; the number of these is usually seven. They must all have been born in the month Tishri of the preceding year; they are usually purchased on the 10th of the month just before going up to the mountain. Towards the afternoon some fifteen or twenty men of the Samaritan community, headed by the High Priest, take up a position near the mounds that mark the ruins of the temple. The High Priest stands on a low stone, while the rest of the worshippers form a semicircle in front of him. He then recites liturgic prayers and passages from the Torah bearing on the festival; in this the other worshippers join, but they all read from books. At certain points in the reading the worshippers draw their hands over their faces and stroke their beards; this action, as has been noted, they use in their synagogue worship. The hymns introduced into the service are chanted in a musical recitative.[2]

[1] See Chap. I., p. 13.

[2] No importance would seem to be attachable to the colour of the garments even of the High Priest, as different observers have given different accounts of this.

After they have finished chanting, the worshippers leave the temple mounds and move in a body to the point on the hill where are the caldrons and the smoking pit. The lambs are now brought forward, each lamb held by one or two men. The "congregation" form themselves into a small circle round the men with the lambs, the High Priest also being within the circle. The recitation is now recommenced, and continues until the sun nears the horizon, when the words are repeated, "And the whole assembly of the congregation of the children of Israel shall kill it (the Passover lamb) in the evening." At once all the lambs are thrown on their sides by the young men holding them; then the *shoḥeṭ* passes rapidly along from lamb to lamb cutting the throat of each with two deft strokes. In less than a minute with scarcely a struggle the lambs lie dead. Round the High Priest gather the men who have just held the lambs to kiss his hands, the older men of the congregation the High Priest kisses on the cheek. The men now sit down in groups round each lamb, while boiling water is brought from the caldrons and poured over the lambs to soften the skin; they then begin to pluck off the wool. In a little while the wool is all plucked off, and the skin is left bare as the palm of the hand and as white as parchment. Next, the lambs are affixed by their hind legs to the thin posts to which we have already referred, and rapidly disembowelled; the feet are quickly removed, and the right foreleg, the priest's portion, is cut off. Dr Mills says that they are burnt along with the entrails. The liver, which is kept separate in the disembowelling, is thrust into the body of the lamb. While this is going on, the High Priest continues his chant. As group after group finishes, the lambs are twisted round the posts referred to and laid one after another on a hurdle. When this has been completed the High Priest takes up his position beside the carcases and begins anew to chant. The *shoḥeṭ* then goes to the side of the pit in which fire has been kept burning all afternoon, and those who had previously held the lambs come forward and stand beside the heap of carcases. The *shoḥeṭ* standing beside the fire calls out in Arabic, *wahed*, "one"; a lamb from the heap is handed to him and by him the long post or spit is thrust into the glowing pit in such a way that

it stands upright. He then calls out *t'nain*, "two," and the next is carried to the pit and thrust into it; and so on until the whole seven are placed. Care is taken that none of the lambs rests on the wall of the pit lest it should be in the slightest degree broiled. The top of these posts or spits comes within three inches or so of the level of the ground. When all this is duly completed the hurdle is brought and put on the mouth of the pit; on it is then placed grass, and thereupon mud, till not the slightest puff of smoke or steam escapes.

When the lambs are thus disposed of the High Priest retires to his tent; the chanting meanwhile is continued under the leadership of the second High Priest. While this is going on a huge sheet is spread on the space between the caldrons and the temple mounds.

At the expiry of a period of time marked by the completion of the chanting of certain hymns, the High Priest who has retired to his tent is informed and comes from it to the pit. At the same time the second High Priest distributes the unleavened bread and hyssop—the bitter herbs of Exodus. Seven new baskets, resembling those in which carpenters carry their tools, are brought forward. The pit is now uncovered, and the lambs are taken up one by one and deposited in the baskets. When brought up the lambs appear burnt black. When, as frequently happens, one of the lambs falls off the spit in being brought up, one of the worshippers descends into the pit to bring up the fragments. The baskets with the roasted lambs are taken to the sheet and placed at separate points on it. Groups of men gather round each lamb; some squat on the ground, others sit on their heels, while others again stand and stoop over those sitting. In accordance with the command in Exod. xii. 11, every man was girt as if for a journey, with shoes on feet and staff in hand. To those of the women and children who are seated outside portions of the lambs are conveyed; also portions are carried to the tents for such of the women and children as have not come out. The unleavened bread and hyssop are now made use of along with the lambs. When they have finished eating, every fragment of bone, wool, or flesh is gathered together and burnt in obedience to the command that nothing be left "until the morning."

Dr Mills says that when any of the community, either from illness or ceremonial impurity, are unable to observe the Passover at its proper date, "they may do so on the same day of the following month, that is the month Iyyar." This presumably means that the date is adjusted to the second month of the Greek Christian Calendar, as that of the regular Passover is to the first. This permission is in accordance with the provision for a similar contingency to be found in Num. ix. 9-12. Dr Mills adds: "This Passover is not celebrated on Mount Gerizim."

There are several features in this celebration of the Passover in which it differs from the Jewish practice as related in the Talmud. Many of these points are of such minuteness that they are manifestly the product of Rabbinic refinements; these may be passed over. Some equally minute features have been introduced by the Samaritans, as for instance, that the lambs should have been born in the month Tishri of the preceding year; this may be mentioned as showing the independence of the tradition represented by the Samaritans. What confirms this is the fact that the Samaritans reckon the date on which the Passover should be celebrated in a different way from the Jews, and the further fact that while with the Jews, the Sabbath law has to give way to the regulations regarding the observance of the Passover, with the Samaritans as mentioned already, it is the Passover that gives way to the Sabbath. On the other hand they have none of the Jewish regulations which prevent the Passover from being observed on Monday, Wednesday, or Friday. It has been thought that the Samaritans had, at the bidding of Ezra, revolutionised the worship they had received from the priest sent by Esarhaddon "to teach them the manner of the God of the land," and introduced the Priestly Code. The way in which the Samaritans have adjusted matters shows a complete independence of the Jews. At the same time it has to be observed that in fixing a second opportunity for observing the Passover, they follow an injunction which is found in Num. ix. 9-12, a passage declared to belong to the latest stratum of priestly legislation.

The point in the twenty-four hours at which the lambs should be slain is differently interpreted by the Samaritans

and the Jews. The phrase which designates the time in Exod. xii. 6 is a peculiar one, בֵּין הָעַרְבָּיִם (*bên ha'arbayim*), "between the two evenings"; it is found only in the middle books of the Pentateuch. The Jews take this to mean "the afternoon," from midday to sunset; the Samaritans regard it as meaning precisely at sunset, as if the one evening were while the sun neared the horizon and the other the gradually decreasing light which follows set of sun. This, too, is a case in which the independence of the Samaritans is obvious. It would seem further that the Samaritan interpretation is the more natural and primitive. The reason the Samaritans have for celebrating the Passover on the midday of Friday, when otherwise it would fall on the Sabbath, has not transpired.

In the actual roasting of the lambs, there are points in the Samaritan practice which are worthy of notice. The description given by Justin Martyr in his *Dialogue with Trypho*, of the spit used in roasting the Paschal lamb suits the spit at present used by the Samaritans. He sees in the shape which results from the small cross-piece the symbol of the cross of our Lord. Justin assumes that he describes what had been wont to take place in the temple in Jerusalem while it was yet standing; in this he possibly was right. At least he does not record any correction of his description by Trypho: the old practice is continued by the Samaritans. The roasting of all the lambs of the community in a common oven points to a practice which must have originated in a village community, and in a country where fuel was scarce. In this it may be noted that there is a break away from the mode in which the first Passover was celebrated. The killing and roasting must, in that case, have all taken place within the house. The Samaritan method seems to point to a time in which in the Northern Kingdom every village had its *bamah*, "High Place," and its common oven. The use of a pit as an oven appears to be a primitive trait. If we combine the Biblical notices with what is found in Josephus, the Jewish Passover may be realised in a manner. The lambs were slain in the temple between three and five in the afternoon, and carried to the houses of the worshippers where they were roasted. The Samaritan mode points to a different origin. It is the case that for forty years the Samaritans were ex-

cluded from their Holy Mountain, and had to celebrate their great feast in their own quarter; how this was done there is no means of knowing, as no European observer seems to have been present on any occasion during the period of their banishment. While it is most probable, it is not absolutely certain, that the rites they used after their return were precisely the same as those of the period before their banishment. One feature has apparently been dropped within very recent times. Dr Petermann and Professor MacEwen, as also some other observers, speak of the blood being taken and applied to the forehead of the onlooking children, and sprinkled on the sides of the tent doors; later observers have noted nothing of this. Dr Montgomery says on the authority of Moulton that this practice was given up on account of the Moslems.

Closely connected with the Passover, with the Samaritans, as with the Jews, is the Feast of Unleavened Bread. During the whole period of the "Days of Unleavened Bread" they are in tents on the top of Mount Gerizim. All leaven is removed from their tents. The unleavened cakes, *masat* (the Hebrew *matzoth*) are thin, almost as thin as parchment, and baked without salt; save for this last peculiarity they resemble the bread of the Arabs. This feast lasts from the 13th Nisan to the 21st. On that day, "the great day of the Feast," they form a procession and go through the village of Makkada. Dr Montgomery says that when the procession reaches the sacred site they halt, having read through the book of Deuteronomy on their way. Dr Mills represents the reading of the Law as taking place on Mount Gerizim, and speaks of special emphasis being given to the blessing of Joseph (Gen. xlix. 22-26). Colonel Warren identifies the village of Makkada with the Cave of Makkedah, where the kings defeated in the battle of Bethhoron hid themselves. The Samaritans make more of this feast than do the Jews; the additions seem to be late.

Like the Jews, the Samaritans celebrate the Feast of Pentecost, called in Deuteronomy (xvi. 10) "the Feast of Weeks"; it was essentially a freewill offering, "the tribute of a freewill offering of thine hand according as the Lord thy God hath blessed thee." It is reckoned as seven weeks from

Passover, that is, forty-nine days, or inclusively, fifty days, hence its name "Pentecost," in Arabic, *khamsin.* There is a difference between the Jewish and the Samaritan method of reckoning the weeks. The Samaritans count them in accordance with Lev. xxiii. 11, from "the morrow after the Sabbath," the day when the priest had offered, as a wave-offering, the sheaf of the first-fruits of the harvest; that is from the first Sabbath in Passover week. The Jews reckon from the morrow of the Passover, regarding the Passover itself as a Sabbath. As in their reckoning of the weeks of Pentecost the Sadducees agreed with the Samaritans,it may be regarded as the primitive; when the Jews diverged it is impossible to say. Among the Samaritans this feast is celebrated by a service in the synagogue, followed by a procession to Mount Gerizim, where the priest recites the passage for the day which contains the law concerning harvest. In the synagogue prominence is given to the decalogue, during the reading of which candles are held round the desk while the priest reads.

Both Jews and Samaritans have a civil as well as a sacred year. The civil New Year is celebrated on the 1st of Tishri, approximately the 1st of October. With the Jews this is a time of great rejoicing, everyone appears in his most gorgeous raiment; in the synagogue a trumpet is blown, in accordance with Lev. xxiii. 24, whence it is called the "Feast of Trumpets." In some places where a sea is in sight they turn their backs toward it and cast a stone over their shoulders, in symbol of their sins cast behind their back into the depth of the sea, in order to begin the New Year with a clean sheet. With the Samaritans it is regarded as a season for repentance, and for preparation for the Great Day of Atonement. In harmony with this idea it is sanctified by a prolonged service in the synagogue which lasts six hours, during which the whole Law is read. It is regarded as a Sabbath and no work is done on it. Bearing on this difference in mode of celebration, and on the idea behind it is Ezra's action as recorded in Neh. viii. 9, "Ezra the priest said unto all the people . . . 'Mourn not nor weep.' For the people wept when they heard the words of the Law." It seemed no easy matter to get the people to give over their weeping, for Ezra had to repeat his

exhortation and the Levites had to go among the people to still them. This day, the first day of the seventh month, *i.e.*, Tishri, was the commemoration of setting up anew the altar "upon his bases" (Ezra iii. 1, 3) nearly a hundred years before. The primitive idea evidently was the Samaritan one to look upon it as a day for repentance and sorrow for sin in preparation for Kippor, "the Great Day of Atonement." The Jewish habit of casting their sins behind their backs indicates the same notion still surviving.

As with the Jews, so with the Samaritans the principal event of the month Tishri is the Great Day of Atonement on the tenth day. In the annual series of solemnities it is next in importance to the Passover. As sacrifices have long ceased to be offered by the Samaritans, there is no ceremony analogous to that of the Scapegoat. As further they have no longer either brazen altar or Ark of the Covenant; nor is there any longer a Holy of holies, if the Samaritans ever had that, into which the High Priest can go bearing the blood to sprinkle it on the Mercy-seat; all the ceremonies of the day are resolved into prayer and fasting. In this they are unlike the Jews, who retain a suggestion of the sacrificial element so prominent originally in the Great Day of Atonement; on the eve of the 10th of Tishri, among the orthodox Jews, for every man a cock, for every woman a hen is killed. Among the Samaritans there is no similar survival. On the afternoon of the 9th of Tishri—the day preceding the Great Day of Atonement—every member of the Samaritan community solemnly bathes in running water. Thereafter they all partake of a meal which must be finished half an hour before sunset. From that time till after sunset the following day, neither food nor drink may be partaken of. Even infants have to share in this rigid fast; neither age nor sickness procures exemption. Dr Mills adds: "The day is looked forward to with no little anxiety."

Half an hour before sunset, the whole body of the Samaritan community assemble in the synagogue and begin the recitation of the Law. Throughout the whole night, in total darkness, proceeds this recitation, partly spoken, partly chanted, amid great excitement. The recitation of the Law is mingled with liturgic prayers and penitential hymns. In

early morning the worshippers form a procession to visit the tombs of their prophets. These are not as might be supposed Elijah and Elisha, Hosea and Jonah, prophets who by birth and mission belonged to the Northern tribes; these are not reverenced nor even known. The position occupied by Moses in the theology of the Samaritans precludes any other being regarded in the light of what is ordinarily reckoned a prophet. In a subordinate way Aaron is reckoned a prophet, but neither his tomb nor that of Moses can be visited. Tombs in the neighbourhood of Nablus are assigned to Joseph, Eleazar, Ithamar, Phinehas, Joshua, Caleb, and the seventy elders, especially prominent among these being Eldad and Medad. On the morning of the Day of Atonement these tombs are visited, and something like worship is offered at each tomb to the saint who slumbers beneath. About noon they return to the synagogue and resume the recitation of the Law.

When the afternoon is well gone, and the last chapters of Deuteronomy have been recited with appropriate prayers, there comes the concluding solemnity of the day—the exhibition of the Law. The two priests who have been reciting the Law alternately now go behind the veil which, as mentioned above, hangs before the sacred recess, and bring out the two oldest copies of the Law in their wrappings of light blue velvet, embroidered with texts from the Law in Samaritan characters. These are opened out and the silver cases in which they are enclosed are seen. These in turn are thrown open and the venerable rolls are revealed. The priests take them out and hold them up to view, then all the congregation prostrate themselves with prayers and hymns. After some time spent in repeated prostrations, the people press forward to touch, to stroke, or even in favoured circumstances to kiss the sacred roll. When these rolls are replaced in their coverings, the liturgy of prayer and chanting continues till after sunset; then the solemnity of Kippor, or, as the Samaritans pronounce it, *Kibburim*, is ended. The latter part of the service has a resemblance to the Jewish *simhath-torah* (rejoicing of the Law), which, however, is connected not with the Day of Atonement but with the Feast of Tabernacles.

On the day following the Great Day of Atonement, the Samaritan community commences to prepare for the Feast of Tabernacles, which is held on the 15th of the same month. They begin to construct booths in their courtyards of branches from the palm, the citron, the terebinth, and the willow. As the Law requires, the whole community dwell for seven days in these booths. On each of these days service is held in the synagogue, morning and evening; during the day they form a procession and ascend Mount Gerizim "in honour of JHWH." No servile work is done during this week, nor is business of any sort transacted. As with the Jews, "the eighth day" (Num. xxix. 35) is held as a specially solemn one. They assemble in the synagogue, when the priest recites a liturgy special to the day. With this end all the primitive feasts for which a claim for being of Mosaic appointment may be made. Like the rest of the Samaritan solemnities it is greatly simpler than its Jewish equivalent.

The Samaritans celebrate a Feast of Purim, not as do the Jews on the 14th Adar, but on the latter three Sabbaths of Shebat, the month preceding. As the Samaritans have annexed to themselves so much of Jewish history, it would not have been surprising had their traditions declared that they along with the Jews were the objects of Haman's conspiracy. With them, however, it has nothing to do with Esther or Haman; according to the Samaritans it commemorates the commission of Moses to deliver Israel out of Egypt. It follows from this that they do not regard the name as having any connection with "lots," or with the Persian word *pareh*, "to divide." They say that the word *purim* means "rejoicings." It may have a connection etymologically with פאר *pa'ar*, "to flourish, to ornament"; it certainly occurs at the time when flowers are most abundant in Palestine. The Samaritans admit that there is no authority for this feast in the Law. It is possible that Purim is really a primitive, perhaps even a Canaanitish feast, to which a sacred meaning was given; much as the Roman Saturnalia baptised unto Christ became our Christmas. It is to be noted that the Samaritan Feast of Purim coincides very nearly with the Jewish *Rosh-hash-Shana l'Ailanoth*,

"the New Year of the Trees," both in date and general character; both occur in "Shebat," and both are festivals of joy.

Besides these public services, in which the whole people take part, there are rites that are connected more with the individual and with family life. Of these the most important among the Samaritans, as with the Jews, is circumcision. On the birth of a son a messenger is sent to announce the fact to the father, if he is not at hand. Although the Samaritan nation is perishing for lack of mothers, it is at the birth of a son that there is rejoicing. Thereafter, on the eighth day, comes the initiatory rite of circumcision. With the Samaritans it is observed with greater simplicity, and at the same time with greater strictness than among the Jews. Among these latter, as may be seen in the Jewish *Encyclopædia*, it is a rite of great complexity. Some of the features have been added recently for hygienic reasons, as the placing of all the instruments in boiling water, and the use of sterilised lint in dressing the wound. The main ritual differences are (1) The presence among the Jews of *Sandakim*, "sponsors," one of whom holds the child while it is being circumcised; with the Samaritans there are no *Sandakim;* with them the mother holds the child. Ceremonially both mother and child are unclean, consequently so would any one be who held the child. (2) The cruel addition of the "rent," regularly practised by the orthodox Jews, is omitted by the Samaritans as by the Karaite Jews. (3) The Samaritans, in this also in agreement with the Karaites, perform the rite on the eighth day even though that day should be a Sabbath. Among the orthodox Jews the rite may be postponed, by Sabbaths and feasts even, to the twelfth day. (4) With the Jews it is a special official, a *mohel* who operates; he is generally a Rabbi. With the Samaritans it is the priest who circumcises. (5) With the Jews it is generally performed in the synagogue, with the Samaritans now it is performed in the family; anciently as the story of Germanus shows, it was performed in the synagogue. At this ceremony, as with the Jews, the child receives its name; also as with the Jews, the Samaritan child gets two names, one a sacred name, usually Biblical,

the other a Gentile name, necessarily Arabic, with a surname by which he is known to the public.

The marriage ceremony is like all Samaritan ceremonies simpler than the Jewish; there is no canopy, no breaking of the glass. When the day arrives which has been appointed for the wedding, usually a Thursday, the luckiest day in the week in the estimation of the Samaritans, the priest sends two messengers to bring the bride to the house of the bridegroom, where the ceremony is performed by the priest, the two messengers being official witnesses. The service consists in reading appropriate portions of the Law in Hebrew; in the same language liturgic prayers are recited, and hymns suited to the occasion are chanted. With the Samaritans there is not as with the Jews a ceremony of betrothal; however, a few days before the marriage the priest sends the bride from the bridegroom her betrothal ring. As among all Orientals marriage is a matter of business arrangement, not affection, the essential part of the marriage is the reading of the contract and the accepting of its terms by the two parties. The choice is restricted as they may not marry any but one of their own creed. Although there is nothing in their creed to forbid it, polygamy is practically unknown among the Samaritans; probably the fact that women are in the minority may to some extent account for this. Divorce is also rare for possibly the same reason. The marriage of an uncle with his niece, common among the Jews, is forbidden to the Samaritans. The Levirate Law, which is still among the Jews regarded as theoretically binding, though neglected in practice, is held and practised among the Samaritans; but with a distinct and important variation. The Samaritans maintain that were a man to marry the widow of his uterine brother the command in Lev. xviii. 16; xx. 21, would be transgressed. Instead of a man having to marry his widowed sister-in-law, the most intimate and trusted friend of the deceased is expected to make the widow his wife. This he is required to do unless he has already two wives; a position of things which practically can never occur. It ought to be noted that here, as in so many other points, the Samaritans are in agreement with the

Karaite Jews. The Jews have still in a restricted way the *Halitza* ceremony, referred to in Ruth iv. 7, by which the brother-in-law is relieved of his obligations; this, however, the Samaritans have not. It is clear from Matt. xxii. 24-28, and the parallel passages, Mark xii. 18 ff., Luke xx. 27 ff., that the Jews of our Lord's day interpreted the Levirate Law in the same way in which it was understood in the days of Ruth, and as it is by the Jews of the present day. The Samaritan interpretation of "brother" must be regarded as a secondary formation due to a desire to harmonise the passages in Leviticus with Deut. xxv. 5-10. The custom of Levirate marriage appears to be primitive (Gen. xxxviii. 8-11). As is the case generally in the East, and indeed among the Jews wherever they may be, marriage takes place at an early age, the husbands being from fourteen to sixteen years old, and the brides from ten to twelve. To conclude concerning marriage; there is a marriage feast at which music is performed, usually by Moslem musicians. The bridegroom is expected to be particular to attend the synagogue on the following Sabbath, when a special prayer is recited on his behalf.

It is sometimes said that the Samaritans do not bury their dead themselves, but employ Moslems or Christians to perform the rites of sepulture. This opinion appears to have been a deduction from the fact that the Samaritan remnant claim that they are all priests. Historically the priestly family, the Aaronic family, died out more than a couple of centuries ago; hence even their High Priest is strictly speaking only a Levite. In reality only the High Priests, first and second, are debarred from touching a dead body; at the same time it is true that the Samaritans generally employ Christian or Moslem undertakers. On the occasion of serious illness selected passages from the Law are read, round the bed, not by the priest lest he should be rendered unclean by the patient dying, but by some one appointed for the purpose. When the Samaritan is *in articulo mortis* he is expected to gather up the last remnants of his strength to repeat the creed of the Israelite: *Elwem Eloenu Elwem aed*, "JHWH is our God, JHWH is One." When it is seen that recovery is not to be hoped for, bystanders begin to recite the Law and continue

until death comes. When this has supervened the body is carefully washed in clean water, as with the Jews. After this purification is completed the recitation of the Law is resumed, and continued to Num. xxxi. Along with these readings certain prayers are also recited. The body is then wrapped in a shroud and placed in a coffin. It is to be observed that the Samaritans are the only natives of Palestine who enclose their dead in coffins. They do so, they say, because the body of their father Joseph was put in a coffin in Egypt (Gen. l. 26). Dr Mills says: "They do not pray on behalf of the dead . . . believing that at death the individual's fate is forever settled" (*Modern Samaritans*, p. 205). This, however, is scarcely accurate, at least for the Samaritans of a somewhat earlier date. Heidenheim (*Deutsche Vierteljahrschrift*, i. p. 420) has preserved a prayer distinctly for the soul of one departed. Either the extant Samaritans have abandoned the opinions of their fathers, or the prayer represents merely a sectional view. Confirmatory of Dr Mills' statement is the fact which he mentions that the Karaite Jews, who agree with the Samaritans on so many points, like them omit the Jewish *qaddish* which, though its contents do not bear this out, is supposed to benefit the dead. It may be that, knowing Dr Mills' Protestantism and consequent disbelief in the validity of such prayers, his informant out of Oriental politeness professed to agree with him. One thing is certain there is no formal ritual of mourning, they do not sit so many days on the earth as do the Jews; nor is it their custom, like the Mohammedans, to revisit the graves of their friends and inform them of the events of the past year. The present Samaritan cemetery is situated to the west of the city. Their ancient burying-place, Dr Mills was informed, was not far from the eastern end of the valley.

Besides those ceremonies connected with the individual which occur only once in a person's earthly existence, there are daily rites of religion. The Samaritans have not the Jewish ceremonial washing, which has more to do with ritual than with cleanliness; their first religious act is the repetition in Hebrew of a long morning prayer, a similar prayer is offered at night. Besides these, there are ceremonial purifications such as those in Lev. x. and xv., *e.g.*, touching a dead body,

or coming in contact with the ceremonially unclean, or with the carcases of unclean animals; there are also those cases connected with sex. The leading distinctive characteristic of the Samaritan ceremonies, when compared with those of the Jews which correspond with them, is their greater simplicity; therefore it may be presumed that they represent a condition of things much more primitive than is found even in the Mishna. It is a question that presses; why did the Samaritans, when they had taken the Priestly Code with all its additions from the Jews, not continue to follow them in their further developments? If it should be said, that the burning of the temple on Mount Gerizim by John Hyrcanus made a breach that was ineffaceable, then why did not the Samaritans extend to the memory of Hyrcanus a hatred similar to that which the Jews have for Titus? Samaritan tradition on the contrary declares that John became a convert to the Samaritan faith; this probably is an echo of his conversion to Sadduceanism. Indeed Abu'l Fath fails even to chronicle the fact that John Hyrcanus did burn the temple on Gerizim.

The following summary of the differences between Jews and Samaritans in Passover ritual, was communicated to the writer by Professor Dalman:—

(1) In both the lambs are a year old, but the Jews count from the Nisan of the previous year, which makes the lambs quite a year old; the Samaritans reckon from Tishri, the lambs being thus just six months old.

(2) Among the Samaritans, women and children partake of the lamb; Jews admit that it was originally so with them, now it is a permitted privilege to them not an enjoined duty.

(3) The Samaritans reckon "betwixt the evenings" from the sky becoming yellow before sunset, till the red has quite disappeared after sundown; with the Jews it meant afternoon and before nightfall.

(4) With the Samaritans the slaying of the lambs takes place beside the pit-oven in which they are to be roasted; among the Jews the lamb was slain in the temple and

removed for roasting. It is possible that this is an accidental difference, due to the circumstances of the Samaritans.

(5) The Samaritans allow the blood to flow, but dip hyssop in it for sprinkling; the Jews did not sprinkle after the first celebration in Egypt. The Jews do not slay the lamb now.

(6) While the Jews flayed the lamb, the Samaritans pluck off the wool and leave on the skin.

(7) To disembowel the lamb it is fastened to an upright post supported by two men. The Jews fastened it to a cross-beam supported by posts.

(8) The burning of what remains was by the Jews left over to the following day; the Samaritans do it that night.

CHAPTER VI

THE SAMARITAN VIEW OF SACRED HISTORY

UNLIKE every form of heathenism or Nature religion, Judaism, like its two daughter faiths, Christianity and Islam, claims to be essentially historic. That God had called Abraham from Ur of the Chaldees, and led him into the land of Canaan; further, that when he had entered into the land, God had revealed Himself to him, and promised it as an inheritance to his seed; these were regarded as definite historic events, and upon these primarily the whole religion of Israel rested. The next stage in the evolution of the religion of Israel was connected indissolubly with another event or series of events. Israel having gone down into Egypt, and having been oppressed there, had been led out of the "House of Bondage" with signs and wonders by Moses: that God had appeared to them in cloud and fire on Mount Sinai, and had there given Israel a Law: that God had led them through the wilderness, and brought the people to the east bank of Jordan, in sight of the land promised to their fathers, these were facts on the historic reality of which the religion and the national existence of Israel rested. The enactments of the Torah, moral or ritual, had their validity and sanction from their historic setting. But the history of the Torah terminates with the encampment of Israel in the plains of Moab over against Palestine, the death of Moses, and the appointment of his successor, Joshua.

If the claim of Israel to be the people chosen of God—the people in whom all the nations of the earth were to be blessed—was true, their history could not end at this point. The initial promise given to Abraham that his seed should

inherit Canaan, a promise that had been given again to his descendants in Egypt, had not been fulfilled. All the wonders wrought in Egypt and at the Red Sea, all the marvels of the journey through the wilderness would be meaningless displays of power unless there were something more. The crossing of the Jordan, and the conquest of the Land of Promise under the leadership of Joshua, is a necessary sequel to the encampment in the plains of Moab. But even this cannot be the end. If Israel is the peculiar Treasure of JHWH, the people cannot be suffered to be lost in the chaos of nations dwelling in Canaan. If the function of Israel was to preserve for the world faith in the One Supreme God, who had revealed Himself to Abraham—and this was the belief of the Samaritans as well as of the Jews—then even when they had gained their inheritance and been planted in Canaan they would still need to be preserved that they should not be seduced by the practices of the heathen around them, or overwhelmed by their military prowess, and so their testimony be lost. From the analogy of the previous Divine dealings with Israel, the subsequent history would be also sacred, as the history of the intercourse of JHWH with His people and the discipline through which He passed them to fit them for the function which He had assigned them.

The agents whom God used to confirm Israel in their covenant relationship were the prophets. On the one hand their exhortations to faithfulness to the God who had brought them up out of Egypt, and their denunciations of any failure to maintain purity of worship and morals, tended to keep them in the right way; but also on the other hand by recording the history they showed how faithfully JHWH had fulfilled His side of the Covenant, and therefore how great was His claim on the faithfulness of Israel. The advent of the Prophet as a functionary in the Divine treatment of Israel was foretold in Deut. xviii. 15: "The Lord thy God will raise up unto thee a Prophet from the midst of thee, of thy brethren, like unto me; unto him ye shall hearken." While this prophecy found its absolute and complete fulfilment in the Mission of our Lord, the whole prophetic order was in a lesser degree also its fulfilment.

The order was itself a prophecy which found its fulfilment in Christ. As may be learned from Josephus (*contra Apionem*), the belief of Israel in the truthfulness of their history was grounded on the fact that the writings in which its events were recorded, were the work of prophets. As might be expected from their authorship, these writings regard the history of Israel from the Divine standpoint; it was a record of JHWH's providential dealings by which He always preserved in Israel a seed to serve Him. These prophetic records begin with the book of Joshua, and are continued in Judges, Samuel, and Kings. As has already been seen, none of these books occur in the Canon of the Samaritans. A probable reason for this has been indicated in a previous chapter.

While the Samaritans maintain that the Pentateuch alone is sacred and canonical, they seem conscious to some extent of the incompleteness of their Canon, if they would successfully maintain the claim which they make to be the true Israel. The history of the people chosen of God could not end on the east of Jordan, in sight of "the land flowing with milk and honey" which had been promised to them before they left Egypt, but not put in their possession. To complete the sacred record, not only must the promise be related, but also it must be told how that promise was fulfilled. Hence it would seem to be needful to maintain that at one time the Samaritans must have had some authoritative account of the conquest of the land. The high esteem in which the Samaritans hold Joshua, placing him just behind Moses and calling him King, confirms this probability. In the hymns in which most of the theology of Samaria has been preserved to us, we have references to events which took place in the conquest. The fact that when Esarhaddon sent priests to teach the colonists "the manner of the God of the land" they were not accompanied by prophets, as has been said above, may have had something to do with the want of prophetic literature among the descendants of the Northern tribes. Further there must be borne in mind the wholesale destruction of Samaritan manuscripts from the days of Hyrcanus downward, not to speak of the earlier havoc wrought by the Assyrian

conquerors. The repeated inquisitions for manuscripts ordered by the Christian emperors of Byzantium, followed by their destruction, are especially to be deplored.

At the same time there have come to us several books which contain the traditional beliefs of the Samaritans as to the course of the Divine dealings with them. They are all late, none of them earlier than the tenth century of our era, yet they may be regarded as containing the genuine traditions of the Samaritans as to their sacred history. As might be anticipated from their being the product of Orientals, the records are twisted and modified to enforce a moral lesson, or flatter national vanity. Still when allowance has been made for this, their general agreement may permit the inquirer to assume that in these writings we have the ideas entertained by the Samaritans of the tenth Christian century, of the course of the Divine discipline of Israel.

The earliest of these is a meagre chronicle discovered by Neubauer while on a visit to Palestine. It is quoted as authoritative by Abu'l Fatḥ who refers to it as *Tolideh*. It begins with a mode of calculating the feasts, and then proceeds to give the succession of the Samaritan High Priests, starting the genealogy with Adam. It is in Hebrew and in Samaritan characters. As the list of High Priests terminates with the tenth century, that century may be assigned as that of its composition. It is accompanied by an Arabic version. At various points notes are added as to contemporary events; the Babylonian captivity is said to have occurred during the pontificate of Aqabiyah; the arrival of Alexander of Macedon happened in that of Hizqiah. More interesting to us as Christians is the statement that "in the days of Jehonathan was put to death Jesu, son of Mariam son of Joseph the carpenter, in Jerusalem in the days of Tiberius, King of Rome, by the hand of Palita the governor." Although Eleazar son of Amram (1149) claims to be the author, yet from the habit the Samaritan scribes have of completing such genealogies and bringing them up to date, the earlier portion of *Tolideh* may go back to a time before the "rule of the Sons of Ishmael"; so the Samaritans designate the Mohammedan Era.

More important because much fuller though later is what

is known as the Samaritan book of Joshua. It was published by Juynboll in Leyden in 1848 from a codex which is in the Library of Leyden University. It had belonged to Joseph Scaliger, having been sent to him from Samaria. The language is Arabic but the script is Samaritan. It is divided into fifty chapters; the first twenty-five of these agree fairly well with the course of the history given in the canonical book of Joshua; it begins the record of events from the story of Balaam. Although it cannot justly be called a mere *midrash*, as Dr Montgomery regards it, there are midrashic additions and details. The twelve chapters which follow relate the history of Shobach, the son of Haman, King of Persia, which is certainly a typical *midrash*. With chapter xxxviii. begins a new division of the book. It opens with a long account of the happy condition of Israel in the period of *Riḍwani* (of Divine Favour). There follows a compendious account of the rulers from Joshua. Only two of the nine Judges, which are all that the author recognises, 'Abil (Othniel) and Shimsham (Samson) are named. With the latter the "age of" *Riḍwani* (Favour) ends. Eli built a temple at Shiloh and left Mount Gerizim; in anger at the action of the people JHWH removed His Tabernacle and hid it in a cave. What follows has the appearance of disconnected scraps; there is an account of Eli and Samuel and of the death of the former on learning of the captivity of the ark; then an account of Buchtinosor (Nebuchadnezzar) who is called King of Persia, follows; without any reference to intervening monarchs Alexander the Great is next introduced; another hand continues the narrative with an account of Adrinus (Hadrian) and his destruction of Jerusalem. The whole ends with the story of Germanus and Baba Rabba. Dr Juynboll thinks it has been written in Egypt; he would date it at the middle of the fourteenth century.

Another chronicle, by far the most valuable, is that of Abu'l Fatḥ. It is an account of the history of the world from Adam downwards and till the establishment of the rule of "the Sons of Ishmael" beyond el-Hegira to the year A.D. 756. An account of his authorities is inserted in his narrative; some of these are not open to us now, but in addition to those he mentions he has had access to the canonical books; but he

seems to have got this access directly or indirectly through a Greek medium, as may be seen from the form certain proper names assume. An example of this is Bukhtinosor, the Samaritan equivalent for Nebuchadnezzar, which has clearly been derived from the Greek Ναβουχαδονόσορος; if the unaccented first syllable is dropped, and the *d* sound sharpened into *t* then the Samaritan form results; this could not so naturally be derived from either of the Hebrew forms of the name. A similar instance is Elias for the Hebrew Eliyahu. The Annals of Abu'l Fath has been edited by Vilmar in Arabic from four codices. There are additions to these which carry the narrative considerably further down than does the original author. It is written in the medium Arabic which has been adopted by the American translators of the Bible into Arabic. A feature of Abu'l Fath is that he lays great stress on chronology, always giving the number of years from one critical point to another. He emphasizes the division of historic time into the two great periods of *Ridwani* (Favour) and *Phanuta* (Declension). The latter he divides into three: (1) from Eli to Alexander the Great; (2) from Alexander the Great to Mohammed; (3) from Mohammed onwards. But his chronological statements do not always agree with each other, and are often very much at variance with facts. Still as he claims to have got his facts from the High Priest, the Annals may be regarded as authoritative as to the Samaritan view of sacred history.

A more extensive chronicle was found by Adler and published by him in the *Revue des Études Juives*, with notes and a translation into French. The latter portion of it, whatever may be said for the earlier and what may be presumed to contain the more primitive elements, is very recent, terminating in the reign of Abdul Hamid and the year of our era 1900. It follows closely in the beginning the *Tolideh* published by Neubauer, but amplifies it from all manner of sources. Very little is given of the conquest of the land by Joshua; it is merely said that it happened under the pontificate of Eleazar. As the first portion of the history has been derived from the Pentateuch, the narrative of events which follow the death of Joshua is drawn from the canonical books of Judges and Kings. Although there is

nothing of the venomous hatred of Samuel and David which is to be seen in the Samaritan Joshua and Abu'l Fath, the writer appears to have made little use of the books of Samuel. Ezra, Nehemiah, and even Esther are mentioned. Of necessity the course of events is altered to suit Samaritan predilections. Ezra gets the Torah by stealing it from the Samaritans, and alters it in passages. Unlike all the other Samaritan historians this annalist relates the conquest of Samaria by Shalmaneser. He does not, however, omit the alleged deportation of "the children of Joseph" as well as those of Judah by Nebuchadnezzar; it is to be observed that he gives the name of the Babylonian king in the form it assumes in Hebrew. The kings of Rome are mentioned in connection with the pontificates with which the reign of each was supposed to be contemporary. The writer has drawn from Hebrew sources written in the square character; thus Paraq stands for Baraq in the list of the Judges; פ *pi* and ב *beth* could only be confused in the square script. It is written in Hebrew with a considerable infusion of words borrowed from Arabic, Samaritan, and Aramaic. For the mediæval period it depends largely on Abu'l Fath, and therefore its value as giving a view of what the Samaritans believed in regard to the course of sacred history is really secondary.

More recently discovered than any of the above is the book which Dr Gaster published a few years ago under the belief that it stood in the same relation to the canonical book of Joshua that the Samaritan recension of the Pentateuch stands to the Massoretic. A very little examination shows that it is by no means ancient: עוֹלָם *'olam* is used in the sense of world (Gaster, Josh. i. 1), a meaning which that word has in Rabbinic, Aramaic, and Arabic, but never has in Scriptural Hebrew[1]: when Joshua is said to return "to his place" the word used is כַּנּוֹ *cano* which really means, when used of a person, "his office," as of Pharaoh's cup-bearer (Gen. xl. 13); the correct word would have been מְקוֹמוֹ *meqomo* (Gen. xxxi. 55). It is perfectly true that Dr Gaster's book

[1] Although it has the authority of both English versions, the rendering of *'olam* as "world," in Eccl. iii. 11, is incorrect. The LXX. rendering is *αἰῶνα*. "The age" would be a more correct translation.

of Joshua is not simply the Arabic of Juynboll's Samaritan book of Joshua translated into Hebrew: it is the canonical book copied by a Samaritan with modifications to give it the appearance of being an original recension. The scribe that copied must have done so from an exemplar in square character for he writes *bashti* instead of *pashti*: as already remarked only in the square script is *p* liable to be confused with *b*. The introduction of the absurd episode of Shobach is itself enough to prove its recency. It appears to be a forgery written by some fairly well-educated Samaritan to be palmed off on the European public as the genuine Samaritan recension of the book of Joshua. Therefore for the purpose of the present inquiry it is practically valueless.

Such are the authorities open to the student who would investigate the views of the Samaritans on the historic evolution of the Divine plan in regard to Israel. As might naturally be expected from the high respect accorded to Joshua, the history of the conquest of Canaan is that on which most effort is expended. In regard to this the Samaritan Joshua and the Annals of Abu'l Fath must be our most reliable sources. The latter is closer to the record as it is found in the canonical book of Joshua, while the Samaritan Joshua introduces speeches edifying and otherwise, and omits disagreeable facts; the Annals are not guilty in either matter to the like extent. There is no doubt from the evidence extant that the Samaritans at the time the Annals were written, though they did not regard the Jewish Joshua as authoritative, yet looked upon its view of the events of the conquest as essentially correct. The Jordan was crossed on dry land by the dividing of the waters, and the people celebrated the Passover in Gilgal, which, however, Abu'l Fath calls Galilee. The visit of the spies to Jericho, its siege and capture are all related as in Scripture. The sin of Achan and the failure before Ai, which in the Annals is called Huti, is duly recorded. It may be observed that to make the guilt of Achan more heinous, in the Samaritan Joshua it is asserted that the gold which Achan stole was taken from the temple of the principal god of the city of Jericho, and the weight of it was enormous; there is nothing of this in the Annals. The trick by which the Gibeonites

became the allies of Israel is related, and also the battle of Beth-horon in accordance with the canonical narrative. The standing still of the sun at the command of Joshua is given in prose, not as in the canonical Joshua in verse. The incident of the cave of Makkedah is not omitted, nor the humiliation of the five kings whose necks were trod upon by the leaders of the tribes of Israel, with the hanging subsequent. The assigning of the territories to the different tribes is related in a summary, which does not designate as does the canonical Joshua the various cities to be found within the boundaries of each. The Samaritan account has the appearance of being handed on by hearsay through some person or persons who had read the Jewish book of Joshua. The Samaritan book of Joshua indulges in marvels in regard to the battle of the waters of Merom, or as the author designates it, Mairun ; the sun delays its setting and fire from Heaven falls on the assembled Canaanites and discomfits them. A feature is added to the account of the battle which would indicate some acquaintance on the part of the writer with the prophecy of Ezekiel. "A mighty river descended from the Blessed Mountain (Mount Gerizim) and watered all the plain"; in its waters "King" Joshua and all the princes of Israel purified themselves after the battle. What became of this river, how and when it disappeared, "Joshua" gives no hint. One more element is given to the picture of these early times, which throws a light on the beliefs of the Northern Israelites at least of later times. On the top of the Blessed Mountain was a temple erected, while at the same time the Tabernacle was also preserved there.

At this point there is introduced both in "Joshua" and the Annals, as also more recently in Gaster's Joshua, the story of Shobach the son of Hamam, King of Persia. Hamam had been slain by Joshua among the other kings. Shobach determined to avenge his father and sent letters to all the kings of the earth. Among these kings was a giant the son of Japhet. All these kings—in number thirty-six—send a letter to Joshua full of threatenings, and saying, as guaranteeing their ability to make their threats good, that they have 60,000 cavalry, and infantry without number. Joshua assembles all the princes of the people and reads to

them the answer which he is about to send to this challenge. It contains threats like those in the letter to which it is an answer, and to emphasize these he proceeds to give a narrative of all that God hath done for Israel in the past. When they receive the answer of Joshua the assembled kings are stupefied, so stupefied that speech fails them; they are utterly overwhelmed at the prospect of the destruction awaiting them. But the mother of Shobach sends a message to them to be of good courage. She is a sorceress, and calling other magicians to her aid, she prepares to receive Joshua and his army. According to the Samaritan "Joshua," this army amounts to 300,000 men, but Gaster's Joshua puts it at the more moderate figure of 2000. When Joshua arrives at Ajalon, he and his army are surrounded and shut in by the magical arts of Shobach's mother, with seven walls of iron, and Joshua himself is struck with stupor. Eleazar the priest who had accompanied the Host of Israel sends a letter by a dove to Nabiḥ, Joshua's cousin, who abode on the other side of Jordan, to inform him of the straits in which they are. When he learns the plight into which the Host of Israel have fallen Nabiḥ hastens to their relief; the fire of God descends, and Nabiḥ slays Shobach with a wondrous arrow, which, shot up into the air, comes down with such force that it pierces right through the whole body of Shobach and sinks twelve cubits into the earth.

Juynboll says that this story is also found in the book "Juchasin," written in Spain in the year 1502 by Rabbi Abraham ben Samuel Zacut. A later Rabbi, R. Samuel Sholam, adds that he had seen this story in the Annals of the Cuthæans. As it is found in Abu'l Fatḥ it might be thought that it was thence derived, but Juynboll points out that Shobach in "Juchasin" is made the son not of the King of Persia but of the King of Armenia. The only Shobach mentioned in Scripture is the Captain of the Host of Hadarezer, King of Syria, mentioned in 2 Samuel (x. 16-18); he is slain in battle by David. Whence the story—it traverses all the bounds of possibility too violently to be regarded as a legend—it is impossible to say; it has all the marks of wild exaggeration which characterise the products of Arabian imagination. As it appears among the Moslems also, it

may be dated some time after the Mohammedan conquest of Palestine.

The story of Shobach does not seem to be part of the original Samaritan book of "Joshua." It has been added by a later hand as the story of Susanna and the Elders, and that of Bel and the Dragon were to the canonical "Daniel." In style it is quite unlike the earlier portion of the book. There is a want of agreement between the narrative and the actions of Joshua. Although nothing is said of any campaign of Joshua beyond the limits of Canaan, yet the story assumes that he has killed Hamam, King of Persia. Notwithstanding that Persia was so far removed from Canaan, Shobach addresses the remnant of the "Canaanites" as if he were one with them. The introduction into the story of the *Gibborim* (Giants) who merely appear by letter might almost indicate that in this there are other elements to be traced, viz., that Joshua had a conflict with the Anakim related in some ancient book of legends in terms as wonderful as the story of Shobach.

If the book of Joshua had been known among the Northern tribes before the deportation in which all the prophets and scribes, as well as all the wealthier inhabitants of the land and so all the reading public had been removed, the book would have to be handed down by tradition. It became the traditional memory of what had once been written. Such a history would explain many of the phenomena presented by the book before us, its additions of speeches intended to be edifying or instructive, and episodes which seem to glorify the hero. A similar phenomenon is seen if the earlier form of a Scotch ballad is compared with a later; as for instance the later version, "The Three Ravens," compared with the grim original ballad, "The Twa Corbies." A similar process may be seen at work in the story-tellers of Arab villages to-day. It is certainly the case that similar results would have followed had some Samaritan read the Jewish book and related what he had read in a loose paraphrastic manner; but the enmity between the nations renders that unlikely.

If, as is maintained, the book of Joshua is the result of the same literary activity as produced the Torah, hence that

there are the same component parts arranged in similar strata of J, E, D, and P, so that there is a Hexateuch rather than a Pentateuch; then why did Manasseh only bring five of the six authoritative books?[1] If, however, the Samaritans did not get the Law from Jerusalem, nor receive it from the hands of a runaway priest, banished for his transgression of that Law which he brought with him, but had long before received it through the priests sent by Esarhaddon, who did not bring, probably were not allowed to bring, the prophetic books with their tales of the valour of Barak, of Gideon, of Samson, and of the glories of David and Solomon; this would explain the vague, confused knowledge of the history of post-Mosaic times, possessed by the Israelites of the North. As Joshua was the great hero of Ephraim, the leading tribe of the North, it was but natural that the memory of his deeds, and what was written in the book which treated of him, would be more permanent than any other portion of the prophetic tradition.

After finishing the episode of Shobach, the compiler of the Samaritan "Joshua" introduces a description of the prosperity and holiness of the people under the rule of Joshua, which may be compared to the Talmudic account of the spiritual privileges enjoyed by the Jews under the pontificate of Shimeon hatz-Tzaddiq. "Then the Israelites observed the Sabbath, and the new moons, and the feasts; celebrating the Sabbatic year, intermitting all cultivation of the earth for one complete year in seven, having neither sowing nor reaping; yet everyone had enough. Further, the Israelites paid the tithe to the Levites of all their animals, fruits, and crops. Of these tithes the Levites in turn paid a tithe to the High Priest." All the requirements of the Law are compendiously gone over, with the assertion that then the Israelites fulfilled them. One case of obedience may be dwelt on, as it exhibits their strict interpretation of the Law of one Sanctuary. "Nor was there any sacrifice of goats, sheep, or oxen, save on the altar placed in the Blessed Mountain." These were the customs of Israel in

[1] If the critical hypothesis is correct that at first the Hexateuch was one book and only later was divided off, his conduct is even more inexplicable.

the days of Riḍwani, when JHWH was favourable to His people.

After his death, Joshua was buried, says the book of the Samaritan "Joshua," in Kefr Ghwaira; according to Abu'l Fatḥ it was in "Temne which is Ghwaira." There were nine kings who, according to the Samaritans, followed Joshua. The first of these, according to "Joshua," was 'Abil the son of the brother of Caleb. The derivation of this from Othniel is due to a series of scribal blunders by a copyist of the Arabic text. In Abu'l Fatḥ Othniel becomes Nathanel, a name that very frequently recurs in the lists of Samaritan High Priests. The first element in the name Othniel had early ceased to be used in Hebrew, consequently the name had become meaningless: hence the change to the similarly ending Nathanel, a name at once common and intelligible; a change made all the more easily that the Samaritans had ceased to distinguish the gutturals. According to "Joshua" the next "King" is Tarfia. From the fact that he makes war against the Ammonites, he may be identified with Jephtha. The transmutation here, as in the case of 'Abil and Othniel, is to be explained by the transposition of dots above and below in the initial and penultimate letters in the Arabic. Nothing is said of the pathetic story of his daughter, nor of his quarrel with the Ephraimites. No other name of the nine "Kings" who succeeded Joshua is given except the last, Shimsham (Samson). The united reigns of these nine amount to 215 years; this with the 45 years of Joshua's reign makes the total of the rule of Judges to be 260 years. A much more detailed account of the succession of the Judges is to be found in Adler's Chronicle. According to it the successors of Joshua are in order: Nathanel, Ehud, Pharaq (Baraq). Gideon and his defeat of the Midianites is recorded, but there is no mention of Abimelech, or of his massacre of his brothers. The Judges which follow him are Tola, Jair, Jephtha: the last named is declared to have belonged to the tribe of Judah. According to the Chronicle, each successive "King" was appointed by the reigning High Priest. As may be seen, the Chronicle of Dr Adler is much closer to the canonical book of Judges

than are either the Samaritan "Joshua" or the Annals of Abu'l Fath.

When Shimsham was Judge, Eli, son of Japhani of the seed of Ithamar usurped the High Priesthood from Shishir the son of Uzzi, who at his father's death was a child; he, as the descendant of Eleazar, in whose line the High Priesthood ought, by legitimate right, to have run, had the right to the dignity. Having left the temple on Mount Gerizim, Eli erected a temple in Shiloh, where he offered sacrifices on the altar he had set up. As a punishment to Israel for consenting to this, JHWH hid the Tabernacle, which Moses had made in the wilderness, in a cave. Thus began Phanuta, the period of Declension and disfavour. The history of Eli is known to the writer of "Joshua" and Abu'l Fath. In addition to the usurpation of which he is accused, he is declared to be a magician. The immorality of which his sons Hophni and Phinehas are guilty is recorded. The enemies of Israel, the inhabitants of Jaffa and Beit Jibrin, encouraged by the division of the people, assembled themselves and advanced against Shiloh. As the army of Eli gives way before the foe, the golden Ark is sent to the camp. Nevertheless the Israelites are defeated, and the sons of Eli are slain, and the Ark of God taken. On receipt of the news Eli falls back and dies. This is, feature by feature, taken from the account in the first book of Samuel. The history of Samuel sustains a strange transformation. A boy of four years old, his father brings him to Eli to train for service in the temple, because he is so bad! Samuel is a Levite, an Aaronite indeed, yet he is descended from Korah who rebelled against Moses and Aaron. There is nothing said of his victory over the Philistines, or the subsequent recovery of the Ark. As Samuel was educated by Eli to be a powerful magician, possibly the victory of Ebenezer would be put down to magic. One of his evil deeds is that he anointed Saul to be King. When Saul is slain Samuel adds to his criminality by anointing David. Abu'l Fath gives a compendious account of David and his history. The strongly sacerdotal character of the Samaritan religion, and consequently of their records, is shown by the fact that it is specially singled out as an enormity that

David exercised the Priest's office and offered sacrifice. His sin in the matter of Uriah the Hittite is dwelt upon, but no word is said of his repentance. The subsequent immorality of David's family is also narrated as if it increased David's own criminality. The glamour that surrounds the name of Solomon in the East protects his memory to some extent, notwithstanding that he had endeavoured to change the Qiblah of the children of Israel from Gerizim to Jerusalem. His action in this matter is minimised by the statement that he erected the Jerusalem Temple on the foundations laid by David his father. Adler's Chronicle enters into more detail in regard to Solomon and his reign. His numerous wives and concubines are mentioned, and how in his old age they led him to worship false gods.

The story of the rebellion of the Northern tribes against Rehoboam under the leadership of Jeroboam, is related by Abu'l Fath much in the very terms of Scripture. How when Rehoboam came to Nablus to receive the kingdom, he was desired by the people to lighten the burdens which Solomon his father had laid on them; how he had asked a delay of three days; how in the interval the old men who had been the servants of his father had counselled him to yield to the people's request then, assuring him if he did so they would be his servants forever; how, notwithstanding, he forsook the counsel of the old men, and answered the people roughly is all related, even to the unsuccessful mission of Adoram, almost in the terms in which the events are told in the book of Kings. The Samaritan historian must have had the canonical book before him when he wrote. The account given of Jeroboam follows in the beginning very much the succession of events to be found in Kings. Abu'l Fath makes Jeroboam the Wazir of Solomon, and tells that, being discontented he fled into Egypt. After he was selected by the Israelites at Nablus as king he set up two calves. This calf worship is attributed to his residence in Egypt. While in the Scripture narrative these calves are set up not only in Dan but also in Bethel, in the Samaritan records Bethel is replaced by Sebastiyeh (Samaria). The reason of this is easily seen; Bethel according to the Samaritan belief was in Mount Gerizim.

Whereas before this, after the secession of Eli, there were three sections of the people of Israel, now there were four. There were, first, the Samaritans, the people of Joseph and Phinehas who faithfully worshipped God on Mount Gerizim; next there were the schismatic Jews who followed Eli to Shiloh and then David to Jerusalem; and then those who followed the heathen remnant in the land and worshipped idols. Now to these was added a fourth class, those who followed Jeroboam and sacrificed to the calves.

It might be thought that something of the stirring history which followed in Samaria would have left some trace; the conflict between Tibni and Omri, and the almost imperial dominion of Jeroboam II. But there is no word of these in "Joshua," or in the Annals of Abu'l Fatḥ. As the history is related in these authorities so much from the religious side, it might have been at all events supposed that the deeds of the great prophets Elijah and Elisha would have been dwelt on with interest. The great mysterious figure that rules over the imagination of the Jews to this day is only noticed in a travesty of his history. "This Elias was drowned in the Jordan and died; and they claim that after his death he was taken up into Heaven and received the keys of Heaven that it should not rain upon unbelievers. And they say that he went to Sarafend (Zarephath, N.T. Sarepta) and found a woman baking bread, and when she was not looking stole the bread, and the baby child of the woman died from hunger; when the woman came out and reproached Elias with the death of her son he called to the child and he got up" (Abu'l Fatḥ, p. 54). Abu'l Fatḥ then proceeds to moralise on the sin of lying in the name of God. The Greek form which the name of the prophet assumes is to be noted as an evidence of the source through which the story had come—not directly from the Hebrew, but through some garbled version from possibly Egyptian tradition. The form of the phrase as to shutting up Heaven suggests the two witnesses in Revelation (xi. 6). There is less said about Elisha, whose name also is hellenised into Elusus. It seems a clear evidence that the prophets had no influence on the Samaritan traditions, when the story of Elijah was only known through such an absurd version and the prophet designated by a Greek name. The reason which

we have suggested elsewhere may explain this. At all events an independence of the Jews is manifested in this as in other beliefs and practices of the Samaritans.

Although Adler's Chronicle gives a fairly accurate account of the successive kings of Israel and Judah who reigned after the schism, it has been obviously derived from the canonical books of Kings: the Samaritan "Joshua" and the Annals of Abu'l Fath, which more truly represent Samaritan belief, overleap three centuries without notice, and immediately after the account of Jeroboam take up the conquests of Buchtinosor (Nebuchadnezzar). In the *Tolideh* (Neubauer's Chronicle) Nebuchadnezzar is made contemporary with the Samaritan High Priest Aqabiah. It is to be observed that in the genuine Samaritan Annals there is no reference to the siege of Samaria by Shalmaneser, or its capture by Sargon and the subsequent deportation of the leading inhabitants. The only deportation which they recognise is that of Nebuchadnezzar. It is admitted that the primary objective of Nebuchadnezzar was Jerusalem. The story of its capture is drawn in a somewhat confused fashion from the canonical Scriptures. Yumaqim (Jehoiakim) first submitted to the King of Babylon, or of Persia according to "Joshua," and after an interval of twelve years, according to "Joshua"—three according to 2 Kings xxiv. 1—rebelled. Nebuchadnezzar came again to besiege the city, and took it: he put out the eyes of Yumaqim. There is here an obvious confusion of Jehoiakim with his brother Zedekiah. Nebuchadnezzar is said to have taken Yumaqim to Beisan, not far from the Jordan, and there blinded him. As to the actual fate of Jehoiakim there is some uncertainty: *cf.* 2 Kings xxiv. 1-6 with 2 Chron. xxxvi. 6, and Jer. xxii. 19; xxxvi. 30. After the capture of Jerusalem, Abu'l Fath declares that the conqueror proceeded to Sebastiyeh (Samaria) the seat, according to Samaritan authorities, of the worship of the Golden Calf, and destroyed it. From there he came to Nablus, where he published a decree that after an interval of thirty days all the Samaritans must prepare to go into captivity. Aqabiah the High Priest, when this decree was promulgated, determined to secure the sacred vessels of the temple from desecration. In the days of Eli's secession, as noted above,

the ancient Tabernacle was hidden away from the sight of Israel; but when this takes place there is no mention of the sacred vessels. According to "Joshua," when Aqabiah thought about this, a cave suddenly opened before him in Mount Gerizim; into this cave Aqabiah collected everything in the temple, and on the door of the cave he inscribed a full account of all the vessels placed within it. The cave closed up as miraculously as it had opened, and the inscription which the High Priest had written vanished. Only when the Thaheb (the Samaritan Messiah) shall appear will these vessels be found.

It is not impossible that along with the Jews Nebuchadnezzar may have carried away to Babylon some of the Northern Israelites. The territory of these Northern tribes had been taken possession of by Josiah, and the inhabitants appear to have acquiesced in his rule. Although it is unlikely that Pharaoh Necho would allow his vassal Jehoiakim to possess the extensive dominions assumed by Josiah, yet not improbably there was some connection maintained between the Israelites of the Northern tribes and Jerusalem. We have no information as to what arrangements Necho made for the government of his Asiatic dominions during the short time he possessed it: as little do we know of those made by Nebuchadnezzar when he wrested Syria from Egypt. Although no word of it appears in the Jewish records, which are wholly taken up with Jerusalem, it is by no means impossible that from the territory which had formerly been Samaria a deportation had taken place similar in extent to that from Jerusalem. When, as noted earlier, "fourscore men came from Shechem, from Shiloh, and from Samaria to bring offerings and incense to the house of JHWH" (Jer. xli. 5), they must have been representatives of a very considerable number of the inhabitants of the territory of the Northern tribes who were like-minded, and whose loyalty to Babylon might therefore be doubted. There is no likelihood that the rebellion of Zedekiah was an isolated act; he would have as allies some of the neighbouring princes, who like himself were tributary to Babylon, and like him had been seduced by hope of help from Egypt to attempt to throw off the yoke. If Samaria was not under

the rule of Jerusalem, still the tributary sovereign who ruled there would not improbably join in the confederacy against Babylon. If so, similar treatment would be meted out to the Samaritans as to the Jews. Should there be found as full an account of the campaigns of Nebuchadnezzar as of those of Sennacherib and Esarhaddon, discovered in Nineveh, many such questions might be decisively answered. It is therefore by no means impossible that a modicum of genuine tradition has mingled with imaginative variations on confused memories of the contents of the Jewish records.

When the Israelites were carried captive by Nebuchadnezzar, who it ought to be noted is regarded as King of Persia, they took with them the Sacred Roll of the Law which had been written out by "Abishua, the son of Pinhas, the son of Eleazar, the son of Aaron, at the door of the Tabernacle." This "great roll," as Abu'l Fath calls it, Aqabia hid in the meadow of Niniveh, *merj Ninwe*. The Israelites stayed many years in captivity, seventy according to Abu'l Fath in Persia and learned "Persian letters." This habit of regarding the King of Babylon as King of Persia indicates a date at latest in the period of the Sassanide domination. Colonists are sent to replace the deported inhabitants; these, however, complain to Surdi (Artaxerxes), according to the Samaritans the successor of Buchtinosor, of the adverse circumstances in which they are placed. The result is that 300,000 of the Israelites are sent back into their own land, the Samaritans under the leadership of Sanballat and the Jews under that of Zurbil (Zerubbabel). When they reached Palestine the question had to be determined as to where was the Israelite Qiblah, toward which place ought the Israelites to pray, toward Jerusalem or toward Mount Gerizim? Zurbil and the Jews maintained that it was the former, whereas the Samaritans with Sanballat at their head held that it was the latter. The sacred books of the Jews named no place, but those of the Samaritans unequivocally designated Mount Gerizim. The king ordered the question to be decided by ordeal; the Torah in each recension was to be thrown into the fire; that which was unconsumed to be regarded as the true. The Jewish Torah was at once completely consumed but that of the Samaritans

leaped three times from the flames. Before it was thrown in the third time Sanballat, after having prayed that he might be pardoned, spit upon the roll, presumably to render it less combustible. When the roll a third time leaped from the fire it was found that only the place on which he had spit had been consumed. One cannot help thinking that this *midrash* has been invented to explain the evidences presented by the Nablus Roll that it had been at one time exposed to the fire. Where an ember has burned a hole approximately round is explained by the story of the spitting.

When Surdi (Artaxerxes) was convinced of the truth of the Samaritan religion he ordered that sacrifices should be offered on his behalf on the altar upon Mount Gerizim. Having received these orders the Samaritans drove away the heathen colonists who had been sent by Nebuchadnezzar and purified the temple. Nothing is said of the sacred vessels—it may be presumed that they were brought out of hiding by the High Priest. The Samaritans were preparing to offer many sacrifices of thanksgiving, but the High Priest was warned by God in a dream that bloody sacrifices were no longer to be offered during the period of Phanuta. Hence, according to Abu'l Fath, from the time of the captivity sacrifices have ceased to be offered. It need scarcely be reiterated that the cessation of sacrifices on Mount Gerizim has been antedated by something like a millennium.

The annalist at this point inserts a list of the kings of Persia but a somewhat eccentric one. To Surdi (Artaxerxes) succeeds Kesra (Cyrus), his somewhat remote predecessor. His successor is Zerdusht (Zoroaster), a notion derived from the Oriental opinion that only kingly authority can introduce a religion. He is followed by Ahashverosh (Xerxes); to him succeeds Artaḥast (a variation on Artaxerxes); and then comes Darius, presumably Codomannus. A note may be added at this point that according to Neubauer's Chronicle a High Priest marries the daughter of Darius. "Joshua" makes Alexander the Great the immediate successor of Buchtinosor.

The first period of Phanuta which began with the secession of Eli ends with the arrival of Alexander the

Great. Both "Joshua" and Abu'l Fatḥ annex the account Josephus gives of the meeting between Alexander and the High Priest, and how Alexander declared that in a dream he had seen a man habited as was the High Priest while he was yet in Pella, and that he had encouraged him to invade Persia. Only instead of Jaddua, the Samaritan chronicles have, of course, the Samaritan High Priest Hizqiah. The Talmud also has the story; but according to it, as we have said above, the High Priest who meets Alexander is not Jaddua but Shimeon Hatz-Tzaddiq, his grandson, a version in better agreement with chronology. A story is told of Alexander in "Joshua" and Abu'l Fatḥ which has all the characteristics of Talmudic wit. Alexander, led away by his flatterers, demands that a statue be erected to him on Mount Gerizim, and having issued this decree departs to Egypt for three years. The High Priest and all the rulers of the people are overwhelmed by the demand that they should desecrate the Blessed Mountain by erecting a statue and they pray to God. In a dream a way is revealed by which they may appease the king, and yet not break the law against the making of images: all the boys born during the king's absence are named "Alexander." When he is told of it the king is amused at the artifice and is satisfied. Following a story to be found in Quintus Curtius and Diodorus Siculus, Alexander is said to have been poisoned by Antipater (Abu'l Fatḥ, p. 89), a thing Hogarth (Philip and Alexander, p. 276) does not regard as at all beyond credence.

At this point, Adler's Chronicle introduces an account of an attempt by Ptolemy to secure the treasures in the temple on Mount Gerizim which was frustrated by Daliya the High Priest, a story which suggests derivation from that of the similar attempt of Heliodorus on the Jerusalem temple treasures in 2 Maccabees. Abu'l Fatḥ refers to the story related by Josephus of the debate in the presence of Ptolemy Philometer as to the rival claims of Jerusalem and Gerizim (Jos., *Ant.* XIII. iii. 4), but in the Samaritan version the conclusion is the reverse of that given by the Jewish historian; not the Samaritans, but the Jews, are put to confusion. Certainly with the present text of the Samaritan recension, the supporters of the claims of Gerizim would have

the advantage in any such discussion of having the Mountain actually named as that in which God's Name was to be placed. It is to be observed that according to Josephus' account, the Samaritans who had gracefully allowed the Jew to state his case first were never allowed an opportunity to represent theirs, but were put to death out of hand.

That Josephus was to some extent known among the Samaritans is rendered probable by the account Abu'l Fatḥ gives of the three sects of the Jews. He says that they are Pharisees, Sadducees, and Ḥasidim (p. 102), the last name being put instead of the Essenes. These the annalist practically identifies with the Samaritans. In this connection it may be noted that Epiphanius mentions the Essenes as a Samaritan, as well as a Jewish sect. The mention of the Sadducees and Pharisees necessarily suggests John Hyrcanus and his war against the Samaritans. Abu'l Fatḥ asserts that though Hyrcanus conquered and destroyed Samaria, he was unable to take Nablus or to destroy the temple on Mount Gerizim. According to Josephus, Hyrcanus did destroy the temple on Mount Gerizim after it had stood 200 years (Jos., *Ant.* XIII. ix. 1). The annalist appears not to have got his account from Josephus, as he gives the name of the king not in the Greek but in Semitic form, Jehukhanan. His breach with the Pharisees and his becoming a Sadducee on account of the insult offered to the memory of his mother by Eleazar the Pharisee, gave occasion to the belief which seems to have been entertained by some Samaritans, as may be seen in Abu'l Fatḥ, that after Hyrcanus became old he admitted the truth of the claims of the Samaritans to be the genuine Israelites, and offered sacrifices on Mount Gerizim, through the Samaritan priests, as he was not himself allowed to approach the Holy Mountain.[1] The obvious resemblance in some prominent doctrines between the Sadducees and the Samaritans probably occasioned this mistake.

[1] This statement seems to be at variance with Abu'l Fatḥ's earlier assertion that sacrifices ceased in the days of Surdi (Artaxerxes). It may be that the offerings presented by Hyrcanus were *minhoth*, unbloody sacrifices. But finical attention to consistency is not a conspicuous attribute of Oriental historians.

After a slight leap over intervening events the period of Augustus is reached. Herod is referred to as having been made king by Augustus. Cleopatra is introduced as favouring the Samaritans and advancing to their aid against the Jews; she is called the daughter of Dionysius. This is an echo of the truth for her father assumed the title of Dionysus (Bacchus). Cleopatra did certainly interfere in the affairs of Palestine, as it had been bestowed upon her by Antony. Augustus, however, took Alexandria and forced Cleopatra to put herself to death; all the dominions possessed by her in Palestine, the land of the Philistines and the Mountain of Galilee, being given to Herod. Notwithstanding his efforts to conciliate the Samaritans, the fact that stands out in their memory is the slaughter that he wrought among them. Of this there is no evidence to be found in the pages of Josephus. This belief in Herod's cruelty to the Samaritans is possibly due to the annalist drawing his materials from Christian Greek sources.

The influence of these authorities is very clearly seen in the account which Abu'l Fatḥ gives of our Lord. "Jehaqam was High Priest thirty-two years, and in his days was born *ham-Meshiach*, son of Miriam, betrothed to Joseph the Carpenter." The title given to our Lord is the Hebrew word for "Christ" with the Hebrew article before it; the word for "betrothed" is a hybrid word composed of Hebrew and Arabic elements. The birth of our Lord is treated as an event of importance and dated as occurring in the 1300th year of *Phanuta;* that is 250 years after Alexander the Great came into Palestine. As Alexander's march through Palestine on his way to Egypt took place 332 B.C., the Samaritan date is eighty-two years too early. Abu'l Fatḥ continues: "He was born in Bethlehem and exercised His prophetic office in Nazareth." "Herodes," he further tells us, "purposed to slay *ham-Meshiach*, but He escaped from his hands." Abu'l Fatḥ knows the names of some of the twelve Apostles, and tells of the destination to which they were sent. Boutros (Peter) was sent to Rome; Andrew and Matthew were sent to the South; Thomas to the land of Babel; Philphos (Philip) to Qerouan and Africa; James to Elia—can this be

Elia Capitolina (Jerusalem)?—and Simon to the land of the Berbers. Finally *ham-Meshiach* was crucified and His twelve disciples with Him in elQods (Jerusalem), while Tiberius was king in Rome. This happened during the High Priesthood of Jonathan, the son of Nethanel. Our Lord's baptism is known; it is to be noted that the Baptist is declared to be a disciple of *ham-Meshiach*. This confused mixture of accuracy and inaccuracy shows very prominently Greek influence. All the names of the Apostles show that they have come to the annalist from a Greek source. Peter appears, in the Arabic transliteration of the name, as Boutros, instead of assuming as in the Peshitta its Aramaic form "Kefa." More remarkable are the forms which the names James and John assume—Ya'qobos and Yohannes. The termination in *s* shows that the Greek form has influenced the writer; yet the insertion of the *he* in Yohannes and the *ain* in Ya'qobos shows that the Semitic form was not entirely forgotten. It ought to be noted that these phenomena are to be seen in the Palestinian Lectionaries discovered and published by Mrs Lewis; these peculiarities are not manifested in the Peshitta. The Greek terminal *s* is seen in Tomas, which is used instead of Thauma of the Peshitta. Philphos, the form Philippos assumes, indicates that the Greek doubled *p* had been softened into *ph*; the ordinary Arabic equivalent for *p* is *b* as seen in *Boutros* (Peter), *Boulos* (Paul). While in the Lewis-Gibson Lectionaries most of these peculiarities are to be observed, the Hebraistic *ham-Meshiach* does not appear. Matti, the form which Matthew assumes, again is purely Hebrew; this in the Lectionaries is Mattai. Had the text of Abu'l Fath been vowelled it is not impossible that it would have been the same. These peculiarities may be regarded as dating from pre-Mohammedan times.

Although the Samaritans suffered so severely at the hand of Cerealis, during Vespasian's campaign against the Jews, there is no reference to this in any of the Samaritan annalists; nor indeed is there any note of the capture of Jerusalem by Titus. In Adler's Chronicle Sianos (Vespasian) is said to have rebuilt Cæsarea; and in Neubauer's he is said to have destroyed Dora. One might

have expected that the Samaritans would have gloated over the fall of Jerusalem and the destruction of the shrine which contended with that on Mount Gerizim for the dignity of being the Qibla of Israel. So far as Samaritan records are concerned the terrible tragedy of the siege and fall of Jerusalem might never have occurred.

The war of Bar Cochba, of which so much less is known than of the campaign of the Flavian Emperor and his son, has impressed itself much more on the imagination of the Samaritans. All the legends gather round the name of Adrinus (Hadrian). Although it is doubtful whether the Jews were in possession of Jerusalem during the war of Bar Cochba, indeed whether the city had been rebuilt after its destruction by Titus, it is represented alike in the Annals of Abu'l Fath and in "Joshua" as undergoing a siege at the hands of Adrinus. Abu'l Fath and "Joshua" relate a *midrash* of the capture of Jerusalem which vies in absurdity with the Talmudic account of what occasioned the war related by Josephus, and the fall of Jerusalem. A Jew from Galilee passing through Samaria on his way to the temple at Jerusalem to offer two pigeons, lodged for a night in the house of two Samaritan brothers named Ephraim and Manasseh. These brothers removed the pigeons from the box in which the Jew was carrying his offering and in their place inserted two rats. The trick was discovered in the Temple Court. The Jewish authorities sent and seized the delinquents and compelled them to become slaves of the Jerusalem Sanctuary. When Adrinus besieged Jerusalem, these two revealed to Adrinus a subterranean passage by which one could enter and by which Jerusalem itself could be revictualled. According to "Joshua" this passage was stopped, and the inhabitants were reduced to such straits that as in the earlier siege under Titus they devoured each other; and they were compelled to surrender. Hadrian when he entered the temple saw images, presumably the figures of the Cherubim, and rebuked the Jewish High Priest for idolatry. This is a curious travesty of fact; to represent Hadrian, the great builder of temples and setter up of statues to deities of every nationality, as rebuking the Jewish High Priest for idolatry!

This tale is told with even more of ornament in Adler's Chronicle. After the surrender a multitude of the Jews were slain, the Holy Place burned with fire, and the city itself destroyed. The Samaritan brothers were sought out and honoured, and a house with four pillars was erected in which were set up the statues of the two. Hadrian then proceeded to Nablus and issued a decree forbidding any Jew to settle in Shechem. Indeed Hadrian carried his favour for the Samaritans so far that he made them rulers over the Jews. He visited the temple on Mount Gerizim, and saw the worship there. In further proof of this special favour, he conveyed to Mount Gerizim the brazen gates which Solomon had set up in the temple in Jerusalem. From thence Hadrian proceeded to Alexandria; while he was there he is related to have occupied himself with the persecution of the Christians. When Hadrian returned to Palestine the Samaritans lost his favour when he learned that after he had left the priests had purified the temple from the pollution entailed by his presence in it. In consequence of this indignity, as he reckoned it, he came to Samaria, laid Nablus waste, burnt the temple on Mount Gerizim, crucified the scribes and judges of the Samaritans, and left their bodies unburied. Where the sacred temple had stood, Hadrian erected a temple to Cæsar. It may be noted that amid the traces of temple foundations still to be found on the top of Mount Gerizim, remains of this, erected by Hadrian, may be found. The reign of Hadrian is regarded as an important period, and it is reckoned to have been 4513 years from the Creation.

To the reign of Hadrian the writer of "Joshua," as mentioned above (ii. 19), ascribes the destruction of the literature of the Samaritans. He thus relates the extent of the calamity: "In these days was lost the Book of the Future Life which the Samaritans had possessed from the time of Favour (*Riḍwan*); there were lost the prayers which the priests recited, suitable to the character of each sacrifice, and the hymns which they were in the habit of chanting in the days of Riḍwan. All these, written out by the hands of the successive High Priests, had been preserved religiously from the times of the prophets through

various generations down to that day. Further, there was lost the Book of the Priests which the Samaritans had, in which their succession was carried back to Pinhas (Phinehas). After this calamity, no ancient copy of these books has been found; nor has there survived any chronological table except the Law, and the book which contained the lives of the High Priests" ("Joshua," chap. xlvii., last par.). According to this writer, Hadrian died from a sore disease affected with every sort of pain.

With an approach to accuracy singular for a Samaritan historian Abu'l Fath calls Antoninus "the son and successor of Hadrian." Adrinus held the kingdom forty years, and after him reigned his son Antoninus (p. 117); the length of the reign thus assigned to Hadrian is close upon double what it actually was. "Joshua" gives his reign as twenty-one years, a number which is in practical agreement with that in Dio Cassius, Spartian, and the various historians of the period. Antoninus, according to Abu'l Fath, not only showed favour to the Samaritans but himself honoured the Law by reading it not merely in Hebrew but also in the Targum, and by fulfilling all its requirements. It is well known that the Jews enjoyed during the rule of the Antonines very special privileges; these privileges would not improbably be extended to the Samaritans. The Samaritan chroniclers make no distinction between Antoninus Pius and his successor Marcus Aurelius Antoninus. Commodus succeeded his father Marcus Aurelius; unlike his predecessors he persecuted the Samaritans. A disputation which Alexander the Aphrodisian, the Aristotelian commentator, had with the Samaritan High Priest, according to Abu'l Fath (pp. 118, 119), was the occasion of the rage of Commodus against the Samaritans. The account in the Annals of the persecution is almost identical in features with that ascribed to Hadrian in "Joshua," even to the destruction of the literature of the Samaritans. Possibly the real criminal was Commodus, and Hadrian's greater name attracted to it the evil reputation of his successor.

After this, the history becomes very confused. Abu'l Fath names many emperors but rarely in their true order. The invasion of the Mohammedans is introduced before

the rise of the Sassanide Empire of Persia. Late in the history does he refer to the followers of Dusis (the Dositheans) and their creed. Later still he introduces Shimeon the Wizard (Simon Magus) in connection with a love affair. Although from the connection in which he appears, Abu'l Fath would seem to place Simon Magus in the third century of our era, he yet represents him as disputing not only with the Christians but with Philo of Alexandria. As to the Dositheans, Epiphanius regards them as a Samaritan sect and attributes to them a strict observance of the Jewish rites.

The framework on which all these notices of history, internal and external, depends is the succession of the High Priests. Although it is asserted both in "Joshua" and in the Annals of Abu'l Fath that the list of the High Priests was destroyed in the persecutions which the Samaritans sustained at the hands of the emperors, whether Commodus or Hadrian, yet they have given the names of the successive holders of the office. This list appears with least admixture in *Tolideh* (Neubauer's Chronicle). The reader is struck in perusing it with the number of names that are unlike those in ordinary cases borne by Israelites. A very common name among the High Priests is "Aqbun," a name not to be found in Scripture or in Josephus. Again there is Baba, another name which recurs; this has the appearance of being of the nature of a nickname. The word means "the gate" in Aramaic, and its Aramaic origin is emphasized by the presence in its termination of the sign of the Aramaic *status emphaticus*. One of the most marked of those who bore the name, Baba Rabba, is introduced into history in connection with the story of Garmanus, already referred to. Of him it is said in *Tolideh* (Neubauer's Chronicle): "This Baba thrust out and expelled all the enemies of JHWH from the land of Canaan and reigned forty years." While the occurrence in this list of names which have not the sanction of Scriptural use, might be regarded as in some sort an evidence of a possible tradition being behind it, on the whole the list may be regarded as concocted and no more worthy of credence than the list of the kings of Scotland which, a couple of centuries

later than Abu'l Fath, George Buchanan placed at the beginning of his history.

One point that emerges is the importance of history in regard to the Samaritan religion. All history is viewed by Abu'l Fath from the Divine standpoint. So far as Israel is concerned it is divided into two portions; *Ridwan* the period of Divine Favour which came to an end with the secession of Eli, and *Phanuta*, the period of declension and of consequent Divine Disfavour. This latter period will end with the coming of the "Thaheb" (the Restorer)—the Samaritan name for the Messiah—he who is to restore all things to the state in which they were during "Ridwan." The Israelites arrived in Palestine 2754 years after the Creation, and for 260 years enjoyed Divine Favour. The termination of "Ridwan" is therefore dated A.M. 3014. There was a tacit expectation that six millennia would elapse before the "Thaheb" should appear, consequently that the period of "Phanuta" would last about three thousand years. This naturally suggested a division into three subordinate periods of a thousand years. The first of these, the Age of Divisions and Captivities, ends with the coming of Alexander the Great. His arrival in Palestine is dated by the Samaritans at A.M. 4100. Our Lord's birth is placed by them rather too early, at 250 years after the advent of Alexander.[1] The Age of the Greeks, which begins with Alexander, ends with Mohammed, whose date is reckoned as A.M. 5050, 'that is to say 700 years after the birth of Christ; but as the Samaritans had made our Lord's birth about eighty years too early, their date for Mohammed is a very close approximation to "el Hegira." The reign of "the Sons of Ishmael" ought by analogy to have lasted only a thousand years, but it has already overpassed that period by more than three centuries.

A survey of the Samaritan view of history shows that like the Jews they regarded the course of history as under

[1] In the Talmud (San. 107*b*, Sotah 47*a*) Jesus is said to have been born in the reign of Alexander Jannæus (103-76 B.C.). This is in closer agreement with Samaritan date than is our ordinary reckoning. The *Seder had-Doroth* gives both the Talmudic date and the common Christian one.

the direct government of God. Like the Jews, they looked on Israel as the Heritage of JHWH, who arranged all the periods of the world's history with a special view to the needs of Israel whether of prosperity or of chastisement. The termination of the history of the world was the coming of the Thaheb and the inauguration of the Millennium which ends with the final Judgment. According to the Jewish Apocalyptic Literature, the coming of the Messiah and the Last Judgment are events closely connected. Whereas according to the Samaritans the Thaheb was to live 110 years, the age that is to say of Joshua—he was not to attain the age of Moses; after his death a lengthened period ensues and then comes the end of the world.

Another aspect of the question which impresses the student is the independence of the Samaritans in relation to the Jews. When they do borrow from the Jewish records it is not directly but through the Greek. There have already been references to this in regard to the form that some of the Hebrew names assume. Elias, as already observed, is a marked instance of this; the natural form which the Hebrew Eliyahu would assume when transferred to Arabic would be Eliyah.[1] Even more marked is Elusus for Elisha, which can be transferred letter by letter into Arabic. Their whole view of sacred history is antagonistic to that of the Jews in regard especially to all events subsequent to the secession of Eli. We have thus on the one hand the necessity strongly felt of exhibiting the Divine side of history as an essential part of the Religion of Israel; on the other the effort made by human imagination to supply the lack of a true account of events. When a comparison is made of the Annals of Abu'l Fath, the soberest of the Samaritan histories, with the Bible narratives, the reader at once feels how far removed the first is from actuality and from the period in which the described events are alleged to have occurred. An indirect testimony is thus given to the trustworthiness of the records of the Religion of Israel.

[1] The name Elias in the Greek form is not uncommon among Arabs belonging to the Orthodox or Greek Church at the present day.

CHAPTER VII

THE THEOLOGY OF THE SAMARITANS

It is the contention of the late Professor Robertson Smith, in his introduction to *The Religion of the Semites*, that all religion begins in ritual. This, however, is only true of the overt expression of religious feeling. The rites and ceremonies, in which religious emotion expressed itself, themselves require an explanation, and that can only be found in thought. These vague inchoate thoughts contained in them the essence of a theology. There must have been a reason why men so universally adopted sacrifice as part of their religious worship. Whether the deity is regarded as the host and the worshippers his guests, or the deity is regarded as invited to a feast provided for him by his worshippers, or whether we hold the traditional idea of expiation as underlying all sacrifice, each of these implied certain ideas as to deity and the relation in which his worshippers stood to him. These vague thoughts would probably never find expression in distinct memorable phrases, and therefore would tend to evaporate as men became more and more absorbed in the business of living, to the growing exclusion of thought. The ritual remained, its ceremonies became stereotyped; all the more so that there was no thought behind them to keep them fluid. When time advanced and men began to unite themselves in communities there was leisure to think, to put questions and endeavour to find answers for them, to put a "because" over against every "why." These explanations would naturally take the form of stories—myths. Mythology is the theology of childhood. There necessarily were further steps of evolution; in Greece this resulted in philosophy, but

in Israel God Himself intervened by His prophets, and cleared away these hard and fast ceremonies and got behind to their moral meaning. It was mainly emotional, the prophet's message; rites and ceremonies, myths and legends were all thrown into the fiery alembic of inspired emotion. But behind those burning utterances there were loftier thoughts concerning God, Man, and Duty, than unaided humanity ever had as yet attained to. As a further step, these thoughts had to be separated and arranged. The silver had been purified, it had to be drawn forth into ingots of thought. The thoughts behind the visions of the seers had to become a theology.

In regard to the Samaritans, whatever prophetic literature the Northern tribes may have had, besides the books of Hosea, Amos, and Jonah, and the prophetic histories preserved in the books of Kings, has been lost. We have only the desiccated remains of their ritual, of which we have already treated; but we have something of their theology. The works of one Samaritan theologian have come down to us, who in his treatises and commentaries, translated into terms of thought the floating traditions and opinions of his people. This Marqah, to give him what is probably a Latinised version of his name, appears to have lived in the third century of our era. Before his birth an angel foretold it, and said that he should be called *Moshe* (Moses); but as this was too sacred a name to be given to any one even at the command of an angel, the matter was compromised; he was called Marqah, a name the letters of which have the same numerical value. In his views he is mystical and Qabbalistic. Another source for the theology of the Samaritans is to be found in their hymns, some of them supposed to be older than our era. Collections of these have been made by Gesenius and others. And yet a third source is the Samaritan Targum or paraphrase of the Law.

Although the Samaritans resisted so strenuously all the violent efforts put forth by pagan and Christian emperors to convert them, they did not escape wholly the influence of those among whom they lived. In the epistle which they sent to their brethren in England, the Samaritans thus declare their creed: "My faith is in Thee, oh JHWH, and in Moses the

son of Amram Thy servant, in the Holy Law, and in Mount Gerizim, the Bethel, and in the day of Vengeance and Recompense." To this is to be added the doctrine of Angels and Demons. Dr Mills thus summarises the articles of the Samaritan creed: "One only God JHWH, one only Law-giver, Moshe (Moses), one only Divine book, the Torah (Law), one only Holy Place, Mount Gerizim, the true Beth El." These are primitive; the doctrines of Angels, of Immortality, and of the Last Judgment are, in the opinion of Dr Mills, later additions.

In considering the creed of the Samaritans, the student must always remember that with the Samaritans, as with most primitive nations, religion is not so much a personal matter as a national. Their primary belief is that they are the only chosen people of God, bound to Him by seven successive covenants: (*a*) of Noah (Gen. ix. 8-17), (*b*) of Abraham (Gen. xvii. 4-14), (*c*) of the Sabbath (Exod. xxxi. 12-17), (*d*) of the Ten Commandments (Exod. xx. 2-17), (*e*) of Salt (Num. xviii. 19), (*f*), of the Passover (Exod. xii. 2 ff.), (*g*) of the Priesthood (Num. xxv. 12, 13). These covenants they are bound to keep; they not only separate them from the Gentiles, but since the defection of the days of Eli, from their kinsmen the Jews also. They call themselves Samaritan Israelites.

Samaritan theology may be considered under the heads of (I.) The Doctrine of God; (II.) of Creation; (III.) of Man; (IV.) of Angels and Demons; (V.) of Revelation; (VI.) of the Messiah; (VII.) of the Last Things.

I. Of God.—The Samaritans of the present day are zealous monotheists. This zeal has doubtless to some extent been conserved, and even in a sense promoted by the influences surrounding them from the rule of the Christian emperors. When the Byzantine power gave way to "the rule of the Sons of Ishmael," to quote the phrase so frequently used by Samaritan scribes in dating their manuscripts, the Samaritans were confirmed in their monotheism. It would seem to suggest the idea of Mohammedan influence on their theology, that the Samaritans have introduced into some of their hymns a formula which has in it an echo of

the opening words of the creed of Islam: "There is not a God save one." This cannot be pressed, as these hymns are of various dates, some appear even to be pre-Christian. However, the possibility of interpolation has always to be kept in mind. But monotheism so permeates these poems, one and all, that this element in their theology is not to be attributed to Moslem influences. As an example may be taken the opening words of the so-called prayer of Moses: "Magnify His Holy Name; One is JHWH, and to be glorified, and there is not one beside Him, alone in the Heaven above and in the earth beneath; there is not one beside Him, He is alone. Blessed be JHWH our God, Whose name is to be glorified and rightly to be praised." To this strict monotheism would Gesenius attribute the fact that, in their recension of the Pentateuch whenever אֱלֹהִים is regarded as a plural noun, and so joined to a plural verb in the Massoretic, the Samaritans correct it into the singular. Of these cases there are three in Genesis; these most likely are due to blunders of the Massoretic scribe, as for instance Gen. xx. 13, "God (אֱלֹהִים) caused me to wander הִתְעוּ from my father's house"; clearly this is a blunder, caused not unlikely by the copyist mistaking *he* for *vav*, which, as already remarked, are very like in Samaritan script as seen MSS. In all these cases, as the Samaritan is supported by the Septuagint, its reading is probably the original. In one instance, Exod. xxii. 9, there is a fair case for rendering אֱלֹהִים "judges" with the Peshitta.

To pass from the doctrine of the unity of God, and consider the attributes ascribed to Him. There is PERSONALITY; how far the Israelites either of the North or the South recognised the possibility of an "impersonal God" may be questioned. At all events Abu'l Fatḥ and the Samaritan "Joshua" alike attribute personal attributes to JHWH; there is no trace in their hymns, or in Marqah, of the notion that the passages in which "wrath" is ascribed to Him is to be looked upon as an anthropomorphism, and resolved into a figure of speech; in this they follow the usage of the Pentateuch. The idea so prominent among the Israelites, of a covenant relationship between JHWH and the children of Jacob, implies a person with personal

preferences. In regard to other Divine attributes, which the sons of Israel were more ready to overlook, from their tendency to degrade JHWH to be merely a national deity, such as SPIRITUALITY, OMNIPRESENCE, and ETERNITY, these are expressed with great clearness in the hymns of the Samaritans. A striking example of this is to be found in a hymn translated by Montgomery (*The Samaritans*, p. 208) from Gesenius' *Carmina Samaritana* (p. 100).

> "There is nothing like Him, or as He is;
> There is neither likeness nor body.
> None knows who He is but He Himself;
> None is His Creator or His fellow.
> He fills the whole world,
> Yet there is no chancing upon Him.
> He appears from every side and quarter,
> But no place contains Him.
> Hidden yet withal manifest, He sees
> And knows everything hidden.
> Hidden nor appearing to sight,
> Nothing is before Him, and after Him nothing."

To this belief in the absolute and supreme spirituality of God does Gesenius ascribe various differences between the Samaritan Pentateuch and that of the Massoretes, in which anthropomorphisms, which appear in the latter, are changed in the former into phrases less objectionable. The examples which he brings forward are neither numerous nor striking. That which appears most plausible is Deut. xxix. 20, in which the Massoretic text is יֶעְשַׁן אף־יהוה which Gesenius translates *fumat nasus Dei*, "the nose of God smokes"; for this the Samaritan reads יִהַר אַף־יהוה and Gesenius renders *exardescit ira Dei*, "the wrath of God (JHWH) waxes hot." It is to be noted that the word which Gesenius translates in the first case "nose" is the same as that which in the second case he renders "wrath." As the LXX. supports the Samaritan reading, the change may be ascribed to the Massoretic scribe. Dr Montgomery has noted the fact, that while agreeing on these essential points with the Jews, the Samaritans do not like them repeat the *shema'*, "Hear, oh Israel, JHWH our God is one JHWH," or perhaps better "JHWH is our God, JHWH is one"; they prefer the less

explicit statement of the Moslems, "There is no God but God"; a preference due to the presence around them of fanatical Moslems.

As a side evidence of the spirituality ascribed to God by the Samaritans may be adduced the fact that they taunted the Jews with having images in their temple at Jerusalem (Sam. Jos. chap. xlvii.). The ground for this accusation is probably to be found in the figures of cherubim, which probably adorned the second temple as they did the first (see Chapter VI.). The taunt is late, and is founded, as taunts usually are, on a misrepresentation. It is an evidence of how austere their spiritualism was that the presence in the Holy Place of those symbols of Divine majesty was deemed a lessening of the absolute spirituality of JHWH. The Samaritan taunt was retorted with greater unfairness by the Jews. They said that the Samaritans worshipped not God but Ashima; a name that had the venom in it of suggesting *ashem*, "guilt." Some have maintained that it was a modification of the name Semiramis (Montgomery, *The Samaritans*, p. 381, n. 18). It is supposed that the fabulous queen whose adventures are narrated by Diodorus Siculus is a Syrian goddess who was worshipped by the Hamathite colonists. The taunt is late, and long before it was uttered the Hamathite worship had given place to that of JHWH. Another explanation for this taunt may be suggested, which seems simpler. As the Jews to avoid pronouncing the sacred name whenever it occurs read *adhonai*, so the Samaritans read in these cases *hash-shem*, "the name," or as the Samaritans would pronounce it *ash-shem*. Another accusation which the Jews make, with equal lack of truth, and with even less excuse, is that they worshipped a dove. The Samaritans indignantly deny that there is any justification for this assertion. One might almost be tempted to think that some Jew had blundered into the Christian church, which in the reign of Zeno occupied the place on Mount Gerizim of the Samaritan Temple, and seeing the symbol of the Holy Spirit, ignored the change of the temple into a church, and asserted that the Samaritans worshipped the image of a dove. The truth is that the Samaritans avoid, as carefully as do the Mohammedans, any representations of men or animals even in their houses.

Their single remaining synagogue is devoid of all ornament whatever.[1]

The Apocalyptists, who represent a phase of Jewish thought prevalent in the second century before our era, had described JHWH as localised in Heaven, and having a visible outward form. In Enoch xlv. and xlvi. there is given a picture of Heaven in which the Eternal is represented as a white-haired old man, and with Him is the Son of Man, "who had the appearance of a man and a face full of graciousness." The post-Christian, but yet Jewish "Ascension of Isaiah," describes seven successive heavens in the highest of which dwells JHWH. All such localisation and consequent limitation is sedulously avoided by the Samaritans. God with them is not restricted to time or place. A striking example is quoted by Montgomery from Gesenius' *Carmina Samaritana* (iii. 13), speaking of the place of Divine power: "No ocean is there, nor sea, nor the very heavens them-

[1] This calumny is probably believed by the Jews still. As late as 1836 in the *Hebrew Review*, vol. iii., p. 400, it is asserted: "It cannot be denied that the image of a dove was an object of adoration to the Samaritans, inasmuch as the representation of that bird is still found in their synagogues." The French Consul at St John d'Acre, who in 1807 sent an account of the Samaritans to Bishop Gregoire, states: "Above the pulpit in which they read the Law, there is the image of a bird, which they call *Achinah*, a name peculiar to the sect. When they name the most High they do not, like the Jews, call Him *Adonai*, but either *Achinah* or *Shema*. This last word is the Aramaic שמא 'the Name,' which is often used by the Jews likewise to express the Supreme Being."

Monsieur Courances, French Consul at Aleppo, writes to Bishop Gregoire about the same time: "In the Samaritan synagogue at Naplosa (Nablus) there is a stage on which they read the book of the Law. This book is hidden behind a veil, which no one but the *Chacham*, principal teacher, may withdraw. At the sight of the book, on which the image of a dove is engraved, all the members of the congregation rise from their seats."

It may be observed that these two accounts do not agree; in the one the image of the dove is "above the pulpit," in the other "the image of a dove is engraved" on the book of the Law. One may be permitted to surmise that either the consuls were themselves Jews, or without going to Nablus contented themselves with information supplied them by Jews. The title given to the High Priest of *Chacham* deepens suspicion; this title is not known among the Samaritans but it is common among the Eastern Jews. The writer here thanks Rev. W. Marwick for directing his attention to this article.

selves." As to Omniscience; Marqah in his Commentary begins by an ascription of praise to JHWH in which he declares: "There is no secret hid from JHWH; He knows alike that which was, that which is now, and that which shall be." When, in His revelation of Himself to the Patriarchs, JHWH appears, in the narrative of Genesis, to assume spatial relations, Marqah sees in these Theophanies the presence of angels who have been created for the occasion. Some of the Samaritan doctrinal statements seem to be specially directed against Christianity and the doctrine of the Trinity. Thus in the long poem in Heidenheim's *Bibliotheca Samaritana*, No. XXI., it is said: "I am that I am, the One, there is no plurality; what I made was according to plurality. There is no place to Him so that plurality should be possible. He is JHWH and not to be measured as if He were set up according to number. Alone He is in what He made, and another He knows not. He has no instruments, no hands, no equal, no attribute."

At the same time Marqah occasionally to a certain extent hypostatises the *Kabhodh* JHWH, "the Glory of the Lord," in a way that at least suggests the Logos of Philo. Speaking of God's revelation of Himself by fire on Mount Sinai, the fire is called (p. 43*b*) "the great fire from JHWH"; in the following page it is called "the fire of the Glory." Later, when describing the passage of the Red Sea, he says: "And Moses ascended up, and the *Kabhodh* (the Glory) raised him out of the defile, and from the depth of the Red Sea." Another attribute of Deity which he also hypostatises is *Qesita*, "truth"; thus, p. 51*a*, "Moses stretched out his hand over the Red Sea, and the Truth said to him, 'I will declare thy greatness in all the generations of the world.'" Occasionally it appears as if the former of these attributes, the *Kabhodh* JHWH, occupied the place of "the Angel of the Presence."

The earliest source of our knowledge of the theology of the Samaritans is the Samaritan Targum. It is written in a dialect of Aramaic, and is dated about the third century of our era, but probably represents the interpretations and renderings in vogue at least a couple of centuries earlier. More markedly than even the Jewish Targum does the

Samaritan reject anthropomorphisms; but while it does so, it does not, as do the Jewish Targums, endeavour to maintain the separation of God from the world by introducing the *Memra* JHWH. Gesenius recognises a tendency to save the Divine dignity by changing, in certain circumstances, JHWH of the Massoretes into *mal'ak* JHWH, "the Angel of the Lord"; in the Divine interviews with Balaam (Num. xxiii. 4), while the Massoretic has "God met" Balaam, the Samaritan has "the Angel of God" met him. In the following verse where the Massoretic has: "And the Lord (JHWH) set a word in the mouth of Balaam," the Samaritan has *mal'ak* JHWH did so. In the more anthropomorphic passage, Gen. xviii. 33, after Abraham has finished pleading for Sodom, it is said: "The Lord went his way"; and this appears in the Samaritan text of the passage; in the Targum it becomes "The Angel of the Lord departed." All this evidences the desire of the Samaritans to emphasize the incommunicable glory, the ineffable dignity of JHWH the God of Israel.

While the Jews developed their theology on similar lines, the Samaritans attained the same results by a different road, and expressed them in different and in more emphatic ways. Both endeavoured to save Divine supremacy by conserving His spirituality, but they have proceeded along different lines. Both reveal the essential monotheism of the religion of Israel. The evidence borne by the Samaritans to this is the more striking that in their case the remnant of legitimate Israelites had such an infusion sent to them of influential colonists, all of whom were idolaters.

II. Of Creation.—The opening chapters of Genesis rendered it impossible that the Samaritans, holding as they do the sanctity of the whole Torah, should do other than maintain the doctrine that JHWH had created the world; whether in the absolute sense of Creation out of nothing, or in the more limited sense held by Philo, of framing and ordering. The Work of Creation occupies a more prominent place with them than with the Jews. Among the few early inscriptions of the Samaritans which have come down to us is one in which over against the decalogue are set the "Ten

Words" of Creation. A very considerable number of the Samaritan hymns begin with what are called Creation verses, *i.e.*, verses in which God is specially addressed as having made the world. It is difficult to reach the idea of absolute Creation, the mind is always prone to insert into the mental picture a primordial "stuff," on which the Deity exercised His mighty power, and from it framed the earth and the Heaven. All primitive Creation myths manifest this peculiarity. Thus, in the Babylonian Creation Epos, it is from the carcase of Tiamat that Marduk frames the world of Heaven and earth. Similar to this is the Scandinavian myth of Odin framing the world from the bones and the flesh of the Giant Ymir. Even Philo, with the account of Creation before him, has to presuppose primordial matter, which is to some extent refractory, over which the power of the Creator though great was not unlimited; hence the possibility of evil. The Samaritans avoided this. In one of their hymns, LXIX. of Heidenheim's collection, men are called upon to give "praise and glory to Him who created the world by the word of His mouth, who made man," "who caused the world to appear from that which was not." To avoid the appearance of making matter eternal, a view that might be maintained from the Torah itself, the Samaritans had various devices. If the first verse of Gen. i. is regarded as the title of the section, then it might be maintained that "Tohu-wa-Bhohu" (without form and void) was primordial matter, existing but as a confused, undistinguished mass; the reducing of this to order might be taken as Creation, this and no more. One method was to assert clearly that God created "Tohu-wa-Bhohu." Marqah represents the Egyptians calling upon JHWH and addressing Him as the Creator of "Tohu-wa-Bhohu." A bolder course is taken by one of their hymn writers; JHWH is identified with "Tohu-wa-Bhohu." To explain this, Heidenheim suggests some connection of this phrase with the Egyptian deity Thoth. Though this view presents no etymological difficulty, there is nothing in the attributes of Thoth which connects him with creation. The term seems to have a closer affinity in thought with the "Bythos" of the Valentinian Gnostics. Marqah appears at times as if he had imbibed some of the

Gnostic emanational ideas, as when he speaks of the seven things which God has "chosen and separated from His Godhead" (p. 68*b*), "from whom everything comes, to whom it returns" (p. 144*a*). The fact, however, that will and choice are attributed to JHWH at once changes the character of the process. Creation can be nothing else than emanation by Divine volition. This view is confirmed by this other saying, "By a word"—the expression of volition and thought —"is the world renewed." Though this is not expressly stated by him, from some of Marqah's sayings, it would seem at any rate that he held that the world was created for the manifestation of the Seven Things which God had "separated from His Godhead," *afrish yathon l'Elahuthah*, "Light, the Sabbath, Mount Gerizim, Adam, the Two Tables of Stone, the Great Prophet Moses, and Israel." This view is akin to the Talmudic idea that the world was created for the Law; and the Christian thought, that it was created to manifest the Divine Glory in the work of Redemption. The Samaritan is in reality a more detailed expression of the Jewish idea. If one may take Marqah as the type of Samaritan theology in general, there was a significance seen in the very letters of the story of Creation. The account begins with the word *B'reshith*, and the first letter of that word is the second letter of the alphabet; this is to show that God first created the Abyss. Marqah declares that had the first letter of the story of Creation been "aleph," the first letter of the alphabet, no change would have been possible.

This last phrase referring to the possibility of change, introduces another view held by Marqah, and probably by other Samaritans as well, that there were several successive creations. This is not in the sense in which Genesis is ordinarily interpreted, that the Work of Creation was accomplished by successive steps; that after the creation of the Abyss came the inflashing of light and then the fixing of the dividing firmament, and so forth throughout the days. His view is not that God accomplished the Work of Creation, so to say, piecemeal, but that complete worlds passed away, and were followed by others; Marqah founds his view on Deut. xxxii. 7, which he renders, instead of "Remember the days of old," "Remember that the world will die," reading

yamûth instead of the Massoretic *yᵉmoth*. There is no trace of this view in the hymns; it may have been the result of contact with Greek thought, especially of the Stoic type. At the same time Marqah does not seem to have contemplated a succession of identical worlds as did the Stoics, in each of which are repeated in the same order the same events as had occurred in all its predecessors. He does not seem to have elaborated his theory to any extent. We must bear in mind that the Universe, to the ancients, was a very small affair, if compared with what astronomy unveils to us. Thus, in 2 Peter iii. 5-7, the writer seems to regard the destruction of the world by fire which accompanies the last things as equivalent to the destruction wrought by the flood. It is to be observed that Marqah, too, has the "great fire which shall devour the wicked, but which upon the righteous shall have no power." One would compare also St Paul (1 Cor. iii. 13), "the fire shall try every man's work of what sort it is."

By the Samaritans, as by the Jews, the created Universe was regarded as threefold; Heaven, Earth, and Sheol. On the last they do not dwell much. As to the Heavens, they have, according to one hymn, seven, and according to another, nine Heavens. While the highest of these, the seventh or the ninth, is regarded as the most glorious, and indeed called the "abode," yet the Samaritans do not localise God in it. We have already referred to the "seven things" which before Creation were separated from Himself by Deity. While Light may be pictured as coming forth from God before aught else definite existed, it is difficult to conceive what figurate conception they could form of a pre-existent "Sabbath" or "Mount Gerizim," not to speak of "the Two Tables" of the Law and "the People Israel." The pre-existence of Adam is to be found in the Jewish Qabbala in the form of "Adam Qadmon." Something not unlike this appears in Christian theology in the doctrine sometimes maintained of the Pre-existence of the Human Nature of our Lord. The belief in the existence of Moses before the Creation of the World is in harmony with that in regard to Adam.

As the "Ten Words of Creation" already referred to throw a light on the views entertained by the Samaritans

of that work, it may be as well to give a translation of them as they appear on the Nablus Tablet.

In the beginning God created.
And God said: "Let there be Light."
And God said: "Let there be a Firmament."
And God said: "Let the waters be gathered together."
And God said: "Let the Earth bring forth grass."
And God said: "Let there be Luminaries."
And God said: "Let the waters swarm."
And God said: "Let the Earth produce."
And God said: "Let us make Man."
And God said: "To you have I given it! And God saw all the work which He had made, and behold it was very good."
And God said: "I am the God of your Fathers, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, the God of Jacob."

It is impossible not to contrast this with the grotesque Babylonian story of the Creation. Marduk chosen by the other gods to slay Tiamat, the mother of them all, leaps into the mouth of his grandmother and splits her up, and makes the earth of the lower portion, and the sky of the upper. Notwithstanding the general Canon that the simpler form of a legend is the more ancient, the Germans and their slavish followers here would have us believe that from this grotesque story the Hebrew story has been evolved. For my part I should as soon believe that Darwinism was evolved from the story of "Jack and the Beanstalk." Even admitting the etymological identity of *Tehom* with *Tiamat*, this personification of "the Abyss" would seem to be a secondary formation, like that which occurred in the Middle Ages; the theologians talked of the mouth of Hell, and the artists of that time drew it as the mouth of a gigantic dragon.

Before leaving the Samaritan theological views of Creation it is worth while to observe the parallelism of progress, with the difference of result in minor points. Both Judaism and Samaritanism start from the same document, the Law of Moses, both reach the idea of absolute Creation; of the two, the Samaritans maintain it the more rigidly. The

form in which it is conceived by the Samaritans, Emanation by Will, is not Jewish. The difference may be regarded as evidence of their independence of Judaism.

III. Of Man.—The genius of the Hebrew was but little analytical; it was introspective, but more in a religious than in a psychological sense. As a consequence, the Samaritan theologians do not treat their readers to disquisitions on the constitution and faculties of Man. There is more than a hint that they believed in the pre-existence at all events of Adam. As has been already seen, Adam was one of the seven emanations of Deity which preceded Creation; he comes exactly in the middle of the list, after Light, the Sabbath, and Mount Gerizim, but before the Tables of the Law, the Prophet Moses, and the People Israel. At the same time they do not indulge fancies like that in which the body of the Adam Qadmon was divided into portions associated with the different "Sephiroth" of Deity. In the "Ten Words" of Creation, the creation of Adam occupies the eighth place, the last of the strictly creative words; the last two are the gift of creation to Adam, and the statement of the covenant with Israel. As to the Constitution of Man; the Samaritans regard Man as having a spiritual as well as a material nature, as being composed of Soul and Body. In hymn No. XXI. 11 of Heidenheim's collection, it is said of Adam that God made him "from water and fire, from spirit and dust." Marqah has a passage of a similar purport. In that hymn to which we have already referred, it is declared: "He arose as the son of twenty years, perfect in knowledge and speech." The body of Adam was made from dust, but that dust was taken from Mount Gerizim. The placing of Adam in the Garden of Eden and the creation of Eve are related as in Genesis. They have a doctrine of the Fall but it is not elaborated. In the poem to which we have already referred, it is significant of the idea they have of God that it is the angels, not the Lord God, who say: "Behold Adam is become as one of us to know good and evil." After the Fall, Adam wandered away from God for a century, during which he begat the Jinns; he, however, returned to God and He

blessed him. He, with Abel, Enoch, and Noah, is regarded as a being of special sanctity. At the same time the Samaritans, no more than the Jews, have any real notion of the nature of sin, or of the connection which the all but universally expressed sense of alienation from God, and consequent need of reconciliation with Him, has with the sin of Adam. According to Dr Mills the Samaritans believe firmly in the immortality of Man. They hold that "the soul at death leaves the body and enters another world, and a different state of existence." Strikingly they ground their faith in this on Exod. iii. 6. "I am the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob," the passage which our Lord quoted against the Sadducees. It will be seen that the theological anthropology of the Samaritans was limited in its scope; the question of Freedom of the Will never seems to have emerged, nor any of the questions connected with Original Sin.

IV. Of Angels.—Because the Samaritans like the Sadducees received as canonical only the books of Moses, patristic opinion assumed that they agreed in everything. Reland, influenced probably by this, contends that the Samaritans do not believe in angels. The Fathers, however, were not agreed in this, for Epiphanius while saying that the Sadducees and the Samaritans agreed in denying the doctrine of the Resurrection, declares that they differ as to the angels, the Samaritans affirming their existence, although the Sadducees denied it. It is difficult to understand how either, with the account of Jacob's vision before them of the "Angels of God ascending and descending," denied their existence. Logic, however, has little to do with religion—it belongs to a sphere above logic. Whatever may have been the case with the Sadducees, as to the Samaritans we have ample evidence that they did believe in angels and do. In the Samaritan Targum the plurality of the angels is retained; had the Samaritans by the time it was written ceased to believe in them, the phraseology would have been altered so as to explain them away. In the Samaritan book of Joshua, all Israel, with Joshua at their head, are represented as praising God who had created the

heavenly spirits, *ruḥani* (genios caelestes). Further, when Joshua calls the people to renew their covenant with JHWH, he calls the angels to be witnesses (*ma'lakitai*). Dr Montgomery has gathered together, chiefly from the hymns in Heidenheim's collection in the *Bibliotheca Samaritana*, a number of designations of the angels, as "Host of Heaven," the "Exalted Ones," "The Congregation Above," etc. In their avoidance of anthropomorphism, and their desire to exalt JHWH, the Samaritans were necessitated to introduce angelic beings as intermediaries between the Almighty and His creatures. When, as already remarked in the Massoretic, it is said (Num. xxiii. 4) "God met Balaam," in the Samaritan it is "the Angel of God found him"; further, in verse 16 of the same chapter in the Massoretic it is "The Lord (JHWH) met," in the Samaritan "the Angel of JHWH"; with this the Targum agrees. Although the Samaritans have nothing of the extensive hierarchy of angels found in the Talmud and the Qabbala; nor of that to be found in the Apocalyptists, *e.g.* book of Enoch; nor have been influenced by the angelologies of the Qurân, yet, as may be seen from a hymn published by Heidenheim in his *Quarterly*, some of the Samaritan theologians assigned to the angels a very extensive and diversified sphere of activity. Some of them wait on God in His temple, watch over the morning and evening sacrifices, and attend to the other rites of worship; while others fulfil Divine commissions in all parts of the Universe, or convey orders to yet other angelic servants of the Almighty. Although in the "Ten Words of Creation" there is no mention of the angels, yet they are declared to be the first created of all the creatures of God. At the same time it would seem that, as with ourselves, among the present Samaritans the doctrine of the angels has fallen into the background, as Dr Mills takes no notice of the Samaritans having any views on the subject.

Although the Samaritans have not, as above observed, the Cherubim, Seraphim, and Ophanim of Judaism, Rabbinic Qabbalistic and Apocalyptic, nor the yet more complicated hierarchy of the type of Dionysius the Areopagite, yet they

regarded certain angels as occupying a position of superiority to the others. There were four to whom they assigned supreme honour; in this they agree with the angelology of the book of Enoch, although the names given to these archangels do not resemble those found in Enoch. In the book of Daniel two angelic names occur, Michael and Gabriel. In the Apocrypha are found other two, Raphael in Tobit (v. 4), and Uriel in 2 Esdras (iv. 1). These are the names which are found in the book of Enoch. Among the Samaritans there appears to be some uncertainty as to the names to be ascribed to these rulers of the Heavenly Host. Petermann says (*Reisen*, i. 283): "They (the Samaritans) recognise four ruling angels which are named; Phanuel is the first, and under him Anusa, Kabbala, and Nasi." The first of these is found in Enoch liv. 6, occupying the place in which Uriel generally stands; it appears to be derived from the account of Jacob wrestling with the angel (Gen. xxxii. 23); the name Jacob gave to the place is transferred to the Being with whom he wrestled, who is called among the Jews, "the Angel of the Presence." "Anusa" is the first word of the Egyptian cry of fear when they found that their chariot wheels had been removed. The word really means "Let me flee" (Exod. xiv. 25); the Samaritans seem to have regarded it as a proper name. Dr Montgomery thinks that Anusa is derived from Enosh, which appears in Qabbalistic literature as a form of Enoch. The Scriptural authority claimed for "Kabbala" is Num. iv. 20, where כִּבְלַע (*Kaball'a*) is translated in the A.V. "when they (the sacred vessels) are covered"; in the R.V. it is rendered, after Gesenius and Fuerst, "in a moment." There may be something in the conjecture that, despite the difference of spelling, it is related to Qabbala (קַבָּלָה), "the secret doctrine," as if this angel were the custodier of the Divine secret counsels. The last angelic name, "Nasi," means "Prince," but is derived from the name which Moses gave to the altar which he erected to God after his victory over Amalek, "Jehovah-Nissi." Instead of the last name Dr Montgomery gives, following Heidenheim (*Bib. Sam. Lit.* xlvi.), "Zilpa," a name which appears elsewhere as that of Leah's maid. He says he cannot trace its origin. Like the Jews, the Samaritans

associate the angels with the stars, though not in so definite and prominent a way.

A belief in good angels necessitates a corresponding belief in evil spirits. The demonology of the Samaritans is not extensive, nor is it developed hierarchically as is that of the Talmud. Petermann, who got information orally, says that the Samaritans named Azazel, Belial, and Jasara as devils. From its occurrence in connection with the "Scapegoat" and the "Great Day of Atonement" (Lev. xvi. 10), the origin of the first is obvious. The second name is probably derived from the apparently personal use of the term in Deut. xiii. 13 (14), "the children of Belial." It may be noted that under the form "Beliar" this name occurs as leader of the devils in "The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs," in the "Ascension of Isaiah," and the "Book of Jubilees." The third name Dr Montgomery would connect with *tzar'ah*, "the hornet" (Deut. vii. 20); as neither Petermann nor Montgomery has given the name in Hebrew or Arabic characters, nor any reference, the correctness of the etymology cannot be affirmed; the function assigned to the "hornet" in the passages where it occurs, driving out the enemies of Israel before them, scarcely suits the common idea of diabolic agency. Dr Cowley, in an article in the *Jewish Quarterly* (viii. 571), refers to a being called "Mehablah, who corresponds somewhat to Satan." The creation of the evil spirits the Samaritans connect with "the darkness" over which the Spirit of God brooded; the descendants of Cain also became evil spirits. The rebellious angels were yet another source for the hosts of evil. In this last they agree with the demonology of Enoch and of Jude. The demonology of the Samaritans is thus rather indefinite in character, but their belief in magic as exhibited in the story of Shobach as it is related in Abu'l Fath and in the Samaritan "book of Joshua," must have been profound: evil spirits under the controlling power of magical formulae erect a sevenfold iron wall which hems in Joshua and the host of Israel. This last exhibits affinities to the stories of the "thousand and one nights."

V. Of Revelation.—Not only has every people a belief in Divine Beings, but also considers it possible to learn from them what their will is. It might be that the worshipper gained this from the flight of birds, from the entrails of sacrificial victims, or from the configuration of the stars. The precise way in which the deities arranged matters so that their will was revealed in this manner, was never explained. It was more intelligible when the gods were supposed to reveal their wishes by dreams and oracles. It was a higher stage in religious development when the Hebrews held that JHWH their God had revealed His will in a written Law. There was reason in the distinction made by Mohammed between those religions which had sacred books and those which had none. A book which contains a revelation naturally suggests a human intermediary who has received the Divine message and committed it to writing. To the Samaritans, Moses was the only "Mediator" between God and humanity, meaning by that the Samaritans. The Samaritans have prophets whose graves they visit; these, however, are none of the prophets associated with the Ephraimite tribes. The want of any prophetic book of history parallel with the books of Samuel and Kings is a phenomenon to be noted in view of the relation in which the Samaritans stood to the Jews. The fabrication of the Samaritan "book of Joshua" appears to be an attempt to meet this want. Moses, as we have said, is the one great prophet through whom JHWH revealed His will. He alone had seen God and had spoken with Him face to face; he had received the Law from JHWH. Not impossibly the unique honour given to Mohammed by the Moslems, not to speak of the Divine Nature ascribed to our Lord by the Christians, would tend to exalt Moses to the solitary pedestal which he occupies in the faith of the Samaritans.

The sacred Torah does not owe its sanctity to the fact that it was communicated to Israel by Moses. As we have already seen, the Law was regarded as emanating from Deity before the creation of the world. The very Tables of Stone on which the Law was written lay in the primeval fires until they were delivered to Moses. While they have Scripture for saying that the Law was engraved on these

Tables by the "finger of God," Samaritan opposition to anthropomorphism appears in this that they make lightning the finger of the Almighty. Whether this highest sanctity was ascribed to the whole Law or only to the Ten Words is not quite certain. A special sanctity was certainly ascribed to the Decalogue, as is evidenced by the fact that it has been so frequently found inscribed separately. Highly as the Samaritans reverence the Law, they do not descend to the blasphemous absurdity of the Rabbin, who represent the Almighty occupying a portion of every day in studying the Law. The Law is reverenced by them as being JHWH's sole revelation of Himself to man. Moses was regarded by Marqah as evolving the whole Torah from the Ten Commandments.

As the unique position occupied by the Law emphasized the dignity of Moses, through whom it had come to Israel, it laid the Samaritans more open to Moslem and Christian influences. Yet these may easily be exaggerated. Marqah's creed seems almost an echo of that of Mohammed: "There is only one God, and there is no prophet but Moses the son of Amram." It is really independent; it contains a double protest, on the one hand against the Christian doctrine of the Trinity, and on the other against the many claimants to the prophetic office, who latterly appear to have been pretenders "wearing a rough garment to deceive." In reality Islam does not seem to have exercised as much influence on the Samaritans during the time of the rule of the "Sons of Ishmael" as Christianity did in the earlier period when it was supreme. Although in pre-Christian times the Samaritans expected a Messiah, as we shall see, in later times some as *ben Manir* called "Moses" the "Messiah." He is called the "first of creatures," a designation which suggests what is said of our Lord in Col. i. 15, "The first-born of every creature." Pre-existence is ascribed to Moses as it is to Jesus in Christian theology, but not as to Christ, an eternal pre-existence. In a hymn which appears in Heidenheim's *Bibliotheca Samaritana*, there is a prayer in which Moses occupies a place almost equivalent to that of Christ, in the phrase which concludes our Christian supplications "For Christ's sake." After references to God's

goodness the writer says, "Oh Lord JHWH, turn from the heat of Thy wrath and be appeased for the sake of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and for the labour of Thy servant Moses" (*ubh'amal 'abhadh'ka Mosheh*). As may be seen the other patriarchs receive a certain amount of honour, but it is subsidiary to that given to Moses: he was before Creation an emanation of the Supreme God, he is above all the organ of Divine revelation; "faithful in the house of God."

VI. Of the Messiah.—When our Lord had His conversation with the "Woman of Samaria" at Jacob's Well, and impressed upon her the need of a spiritual religion, she appealed to the national expectation of the Messiah "who would teach them all things." Confirmatory of this is the fact that in the *Carmina Samaritana* there are many references to the coming of one who should restore unity to Israel and subdue "seven nations"; the reference of the latter statement being to the "seven nations" whom Joshua subdued. Although Messiah is not the name ordinarily given to Him whom they expect, they sometimes so speak of Him as in the Ludolf letters (III.) the Samaritans say, "The Messiah has not yet arisen." The name by which He is generally designated is "Thaheb." There is considerable discussion as to the precise meaning of this title. The root of the word appears to be the Aramaic equivalent of the Hebrew שוב *shubh* changed into תהב *thahebh;* here the *tav* takes the place of *shin* in accordance with the character of the Samaritan, and *he* the place of *vav*. Thus the root contains the idea of "returning." In the participle, in which the *vav* reappears, the word assumes a subjective sense and means repentance. This suggests that the work ascribed to the Thaheb was not wholly that of a military conqueror, who would in a material sense "restore the kingdom to Israel." It is to be noted that while שוב *shubh* occurs in the Hebrew Pentateuch close upon 180 times, only once is it rendered in the Samaritan Targum by any derivative of תהב *thahebh;* sometimes the Hebrew root itself appears.

The emphasis of the Samaritan idea of the Messiah lies in a different direction from that of the Jews. The Thaheb is one who will restore spiritually the people of Israel to the

covenant relation to JHWH, which so far as obvious signs are concerned they have meanwhile lost, and politically give them dominion over the nations. As a preliminary to this, he will reunite Judah to Ephraim. On the ground of etymology it has been held by some that there was a belief among the Samaritans that the Thaheb would be a re-incarnation of Moses; of this there seems no proof. A Christian writer, Eulogius, says that the Samaritans expect a reappearance of Joshua; that also remains unconfirmed from Samaritan sources. Although "anointed Royalty," the prominent element in the Jewish conception, is secondary in Samaritan theology, it is not absent; Joshua is called a king, and so are such of the judges as they recognise. Kingship had not such a hold on the Israelites of the North as it had among the Jews; the imperial glories of David and Solomon and the long succession of sovereigns of the Davidic race gave kingship a glory which the ever-changing dynasties of the Ephraimite tribes never could have. Moreover, for a short while under the Hasmonæan and Herodian rulers kingship was in name revived. The prophetic idea of the successor of Moses was looked upon as more essential. A very interesting addition to our knowledge of Samaritan Christology was given to the world by Dr Merx at the Stockholm Congress of Orientalists in 1889, in the form of a pre-Christian hymn in honour of the Thaheb. It is clearly assumed that this "Thaheb" of the Samaritans is inferior to Moses; while Moses lived 120 years, the life of the "Thaheb" was to be only 110 years, the years of the life of Joshua. Though in this hymn the conquering side of the Restorer's work is that which is most prominent, the prophetic side is that which is first referred to; as preliminary to his conquering progress "JHWH will call him and teach him His Law, and clothe him with His prophecy." At the same time, he is pre-eminently a conqueror וַיִּמְלֹךְ אַחַד עָשָׂר גּוֹיִם "And he shall reign over eleven nations." His kingdom, however, was only to be a temporary one, much like the Messiah expected by the cultivated of the orthodox Jews. As, however, he was at the same time to be "The prophet like unto Moses" his resemblance to the Messiah expected by the Samaritan woman is striking; an anointed one who

yet was a heavenly teacher who would show his people all things.

A later Scriptural notice of the Samaritans reveals another aspect of their Christology. When the evangelist Philip came to Samaria, he found Simon Magus occupying a position of great influence among the inhabitants of that district. He evidently had veiled his claims by using mysterious indefinite terms in regard to them. His followers went further, they declared him to be "the mighty power of God." This would imply not only that Simon claimed to be the "Thaheb," but that the "Thaheb" according to his claim was a much loftier personage than one who was about to repeat in his own person the glories of Joshua; rather he seems to have claimed to be the incarnation of the "Logos" of Philo, in short a Samaritan Jesus Christ. Indeed, Jerome in his Commentary on Matt. xxiv. represents Simon as saying, "I am the Word of God." This, however, must have been written long afterwards, if Jerome's account is accurate, as Jerome further represents him as claiming to be the "Paraclete"—a claim that implies a dependence on the fourth Gospel. It is possible that the latter designation had been drawn from a work of some follower of Simon, and therefore not necessarily representing Samaritan thought. Even if the words were really Simon's they might represent a change in his own views consequent on his intercourse with the Christian apostles and evangelists. On being rejected by the Apostles Simon may have redefined his position, and declared himself no longer the Messiah; that by his baptism he had acknowledged Jesus to be, but claimed to be the Paraclete promised by Jesus. Though the word *parakletos* is solely Johannine, so far as the New Testament is concerned, it yet may have originated with our Lord Himself. The modification our Lord's words have sustained in passing through John's memory may have been less than we are sometimes inclined to think; the term Paraclete, as applied to Christ's promised successor, who should complete His work, might have become part of the ordinary language of the Christian Church, though this, because no other of the New Testament writers had found occasion to use it, has not been recog-

nised. This view is favoured by the fact that the term had got into Rabbinic.

Like the Jews and not a few of the Christian Fathers, the Samaritans expected the Thaheb at the beginning of the seventh millennium of the world's history. According to their own reckoning, which is very uncertain as to the post-pentateuchal period, this date is long past; Dr Montgomery tells of a letter sent off by the Samaritan community in 1808 which was dated by them "Since the Creation 6246 years." Petermann who visited Nablus in 1853 found the Samaritans expecting the advent of the "Thaheb" in five years. When Dr Mills, who visited them in 1860, interrogated them they postponed the date to 1910. When they now may expect him it is impossible to say, as they are reticent on the subject; they probably have now reverted to the opinion of Scaliger's correspondents, "God only knows the time when the 'Thaheb' will appear." They expect him to be of the seed of Joseph. They meet the difficulty that in their community there are no descendants of Joseph by expressing their belief that somewhere, east or west, there are Samaritan communities in which will be found descendants of Joseph who have kept their genealogy. From one of these communities will come the deliverer, the "Thaheb." The Jews have an idea of a Messiah ben Joseph, who will precede the Messiah ben David, and will fulfil the prophecies of a suffering Messiah.

VII. Of the Last Things.—With the Jewish Apocalyptists the appearance of the Messiah was expected to be the immediate precursor of the Last Judgment and the end of the world. The Samaritan view differs from this; the reign of the "Thaheb" is supposed merely to begin the Millennium. When this period of peace and righteousness, and for the people of God, prosperity, comes to an end, the abounding wickedness of the Gentiles will move JHWH to wrath; as before the Flood, "the whole earth had corrupted its way before the Lord," so after the Sabbatic millennium. One cannot fail to observe the resemblance which this bears to the scheme of history presented in the Apocalypse of St John. After Satan has been bound a thousand years, he

is to be loosed a little season, when he will "come forth to deceive the nations" (Rev. xx. 3, 8). The eschatology of the Samaritans had therefore several points of resemblance to that of the Early Church; the coming of the Messiah was, according to neither, the immediate precursor of the Last Judgment, and between the Millennium and that solemn event there is to be a period of falling away.

Eschatology has an individual as well as a general reference. In regard to the individual, it has to a certain extent been considered under "Man"; it has been shown that the Samaritans held that the soul was immortal, but also that there was a resurrection of the body. In the earliest expression of their faith which the Samaritans sent "to their brethren in the West" there is certainly no clause which affirms the Resurrection, yet from the presence in it of a clause which states their belief "In the day of Vengeance and Recompense," it would seem necessarily to follow. Certainly the Samaritans affirmed their belief in the resurrection of the body in their conversations with Dr Mills (*Modern Samaritans*, p. 219). One of their proof texts was "I, even I am He, and there is no God with me, I kill and I make alive" (Deut. xxxii. 39). The doctrine is fully developed in Marqah. It is to be observed that Origen in his Commentary on Matt. xxii. 23-33, assumes that, like the Sadducees, the Samaritans deny the Resurrection. So Epiphanius, speaking of the Sadducees, says: "They reject the Resurrection of the dead, thinking like the Samaritans." The received date for Marqah is between these two Fathers. As Marqah's evidence is from within, it is to be preferred.

Abisha's description of the Last Day would seem to have been influenced by the Revelation of St John. "Then will be annihilated all beings from man even to cattle and birds, from grass and herbs to forest trees and fruit trees. All hard and stony rocks, all valleys and mountains will then disappear, only the sacred mountain will remain in the midst of its gardens, a place of refuge for all. Then shall all flesh perish from fear of the God of Israel. Then speaks the Kabodh JHWH 'the Glory of the Lord,' the Memra, the Logos, 'See now that I even I am He, and beside me there is no God.' When He has spoken, every

place will heave in which the dead have been buried. Then the earth itself shall split up, and out of it shall ascend an odour, the odour of the returning Israelites, an odour like the smell of myrtles. They stand there bearing the infirmities, which they had when they were put in their graves. The prophets and the priests will be there, and among them Moses. And Moses shall pray for his people, and Aaron and his sons shall offer propitiation. The people shall then be divided, the pious shall go into the Garden of Eden, they shall be in one part, in another part the wicked shall stand smoking before the fire. Moses shall pray for them, and they shall all be turned into dust." This conditional immortality applies only to the children of Israel, as is seen by what follows. Heidenheim says that, according to the Talmud, the dust of the wicked forms a footstool for the righteous in Paradise. "When the Gentiles shall rise out of their graves they shall be naked, smelling vilely. Their faces shall be covered with blackness. They have no saviour nor any one to set them free from the flames of fire; this fire shall burn them in deepest sheol." According to this account of the Last Things, the number of those who are permitted to enter into the Garden of Eden must be extremely limited; only the pious among the children of Israel are to have that privilege, the wicked of the children of the Holy People are, as has been seen, to be turned into ashes. To all nations, lasting, presumably everlasting, tortures are assigned. The Samaritans of half a century ago were, according to Dr Mills, not quite sure whether the life after the Resurrection would be everlasting or not; they declared that this would depend entirely on the will of God. Amram, Dr Mills' informant, admitted that the question had never been put or considered in their theology. The limited number of those the Samaritans admit to their Paradise is necessitated by the limited boundaries they assign to it. As, according to their belief, the primitive Eden was situated within the limits of Mount Gerizim, so too the Paradise of eternal blessedness is placed in this same Holy Mountain. It may be noted that the Samaritan theologians do not dwell as does Mohammed on the elements that constitute the bliss of Paradise; in regard to this they

are wisely reticent. As to the place of punishment the Samaritans are equally silent.

Summary.

While in regard to theology the views of the Jews and the Samaritans are essentially one, there are not a few minor points in which they differ. The primary doctrine of Israelitism is, and always has been the unity and spirituality of God. The Samaritans manifest a greater sensitiveness than the Jews to anything that would seem to impinge on either of these sides of the doctrine concerning God. Such doctrines, to be received at all, must be grasped in all their sharpness. The Samaritans appear to have stereotyped their monotheism at a time when the two sections of Israelitism had separated from each other. It may be said that when the priest from Nineveh preached JHWH and His worship to the heathen colonists, these colonists endeavoured to combine the new faith with the old idol worship (2 Kings xvii. 33). We must bear in mind that all primitive religions were essentially monotheistic, but as in Roman Catholic countries the saints get more prayers than God, so among the nations, the lower gods usurped the honours due to the Most High. The contrast then, in the case of these colonists, was between an absolute monotheism in which the Supreme alone was worshipped and believed in, and a Supreme God believed in merely in a vague way, but not worshipped because He was too good ever to do them hurt and too great to care about their acts of worship. The heathen gave his worship to lower gods who were nearer him, who were malevolent enough to will to hurt him, and at the same time near enough to appreciate his prayers and sacrifices. The syncretism must soon have broken down. When the Samaritans, as we already had occasion to remark, offered Zerubbabel to assist in the rebuilding of the temple at Jerusalem, they claim to have been worshippers of JHWH from the days of Esarhaddon; the Jews in refusing their assistance do not deny the purity of their worship or assert the intrusion of any polytheistic elements into it. Having got rid of the subordinate deities, with the zeal of new converts, they carry out their new faith to its logical

conclusions; hence they become even stricter in their monotheism and in their rejection of everything like idolatry. The case of Islam is in point. The unitarianism of the Moslem is more in evidence than that of the Jew, and their rejection of everything approaching to image-making. No pictures of men or animals are to be found in the house of an Orthodox Moslem. Originally the Moslems had been image-worshippers; the Kaaba was full of idols. In like manner the Samaritans obeyed the Second Commandment with absolute literalness: while the Jews introduced Cherubim into the adornment of the temple in Jerusalem, the Samaritans built theirs bare of all such adornment. Indeed they taunted the Jews with their failure to keep the Law in all its purity. This could scarcely have dated from the time of Ezra, nor does the mood of mind harmonise with the placid adoption wholesale of the Ezrahitic additions to the Law.

The Samaritan effort to maintain the absoluteness of Creation manifests a similar effort after the logical. The doctrine of the angels affords the clearest proof of the primitive character of Samaritan theology. It is clear that Samaritan angelology dates from a period before Ezra brought "the names of the angels from Babylon." Later they seem to have imitated the Jews in giving names to the angels, but these generally are formed on a totally different principle from that which rules in Jewish angelic nomenclature. The Samaritans have formed their angelic names ingeniously from texts of Scripture. The Jews on the other hand have taken attributive statements concerning Deity and added to them the syllable *el*, *e.g.*, Uriel, the Light of God or God is my Light; Raphael, God the healer. If the Samaritans got the Law from Manasseh after Ezra had brought the names of the angels, why were the angelic names not received also? So too with the evil spirits, the Samaritan names are quite different from the Jewish. It is evident that Samaritanism represents a type of Israelitism which existed before the angels were named. Samaritan Christology is also independent of the Jewish. The title "Thaheb" regards the work of the promised deliverer from a point of view totally different from that of the Jews. The

eschatology of the Samaritans, conditioned as it is by the place assigned to Mount Gerizim, is in marked contrast to that of Judaism, but it is manifestly a later growth.

Supplementary Note.

It may be observed that no use has been made in the foregoing of Dr L. Wreschner's pamphlet, *Samaritanische Traditionen mitgeteilt und nach ihrer geschichtlichen Entwickelung untersucht*, because the views of the writer have been so overladen with Jewish prejudice that his conclusions are practically valueless. He assigns reasons, in themselves not at all cogent, for maintaining that all the Samaritan differences from orthodox Judaism are late, without considering arguments which seem much stronger, pointing to an opposite conclusion. Thus he assumes that the Samaritans *rejected* the traditional text of the Pentateuch, and never takes any account of the possibility that the Samaritan text is in many cases the primitive, prior to that adopted by the Jews. Exaggerating the resemblance between the Sadducees and the Samaritans into an identity, he argues that it is more likely that the Samaritans borrowed their doctrines from the Sadducees than that "the important sect of the Sadducees, sprung from the soil of Judaism," should adopt from an inconsiderable foreign sect explanations of the Law. Nor is a third possibility noted that the resemblances between these two sects are due to similar causes operating independently. The source of both is sacerdotalism: the Sadducees were the priestly party among the Jews, and the Samaritans, as they got their revived knowledge of the Law through the priests sent by Esarhaddon, had no indication given them of the spiritual aspirations which tradition had carried down along with the precepts of the Law, the custodiers of which were the Prophets. So too Wreschner would account for the many resemblances between Samaritanism and the doctrines of the Karaites: the Samaritans borrowed from the Karaites. The origin of the similarities appears to be totally different; the Karaites by rejecting the interpretations of the Law introduced by the Pharisaic Rabbin reached a position in point of doctrine in many cases identical with that of the

Samaritans who had never accepted them. He assumes a heathen origin for some of the Samaritan peculiarities, *e.g.*, the restriction of the Levirate Law to the case of a virgin betrothed whose husband had died before the marriage was consummated; this Wreschner considers borrowed from India, without indicating any way in which this variation had been introduced into Samaria from so remote a source. It may be noted that the authority for this being a doctrine of the Samaritans is the very suspicious one of a Talmudic treatise. Dr Wreschner arguing from the way in which the Samaritans escaped the persecution which Epiphanes directed against the Jews—a fact known only from the biased evidence of Josephus—deduces that the Samaritans very readily adopted the views of others. He utterly ignores the terrible persecutions which the Samaritans endured at the hands of the pagan emperors of Rome, and the persecutions still more terrible which they suffered from Christian Byzantine emperors. From these persecutions the Jews were exempt.

CHAPTER VIII

THE EVOLUTION OF THE SAMARITAN SCRIPT

It is impossible to go back historically, to the origin of writing. By the very nature of the case there could be no record of the time when man first found out a way to make his thoughts permanent. Possibly from the beginning of that earlier time when man learned to communicate to others his thoughts and feelings by audible signs, by speech, the words would be emphasized and explained by gestures, signs which appealed to sight. But to convey thought beyond the range of the voice, still more to hand it on to the future, something more was needed, hence the step was taken of depicting visible signs; not only making thought visible but permanent. The sound of a voice is dissipated when spoken, but *litera scripta manet.* The earliest stage of writing was of necessity hieroglyphic — things were represented by the pictures of them; an ox would be expressed by the roughly drawn picture of an ox. An action would be suggested by drawing the figure of a person performing it; as running, by a person running. An emotion, though more elusive, could be depicted by showing a person in the attitude naturally assumed by one under it, as grief by a figure sitting with the hand on the forehead. Such a written language would be quite independent of vocal speech. The picture of a horse would be recognised everywhere for what it was, but while an Englishman would call it "a horse," a Frenchman would name it "un cheval," and a German "ein pferd." Such a written language, totally divorced from speech, is easily conceived, but as a matter of fact, Chinese is the only language that is to any serious extent ideographic. Among Western nations, numerals are the only ideographs

in general use; to them all the numerical signs, Roman and Arabic, have the same meaning, but are designated by very different words.

Although by means of conventions its scope could be considerably extended, it would soon be found very difficult to express anything but the simplest facts by an ideographic language. The vocal signs that existed alongside the visible had, by convention, a greater capacity for conveying shades of meaning; hence arose the practice of giving vocal language visible signs, instead of expressing thought directly by more or less conventionalised hieroglyphs, doing so indirectly by visualised words. When the name of a thing was composed of syllables, each of which was significant, it was natural that these would be represented each by the picture of the thing signified. This stage is found represented both in Egypt and Assyria. Convention came in to extend the meaning of the picture when it represented a syllable. When each syllable was thus depicted, the unity of the word which they formed was indicated by subjoining a separate sign, which showed whether it was a person or a place that was intended. A further step in analysis was taken when the initial sound in a name was all that was supposed to be represented by the picture. In this an approach was made to strictly alphabetic writing; but only an approach, as the same sound was often represented by different signs, while again the same signs might represent different sounds.

Meantime a process of simplification and conventionalising was going on in regard to the hieroglyphic symbols, especially in Assyria. The fact that the alluvial plain of Babylon did not supply stone but did a fine clay which could be formed into tablets, on which a fine pointed wooden chisel might be used, led to modification of the hieroglyphic pictures in one direction. Egypt, which had no strata of fine clay, had the papyrus reed, the pith of which supplied another material for writing on; this led to modification in another direction. Characters were not so naturally inscribed on it by a chisel as by a reed pen dipped in ink. In the hieratic and demotic script of Egypt, the hieroglyphs tended to assume curved lines instead of the upright and horizontal wedges affected in the plains of Babylon. The Hittites

who also had a hieroglyphic language did not invent for themselves a cursive script but adopted the Assyrian, cumbrous as it seems to us.

This, however, must be developed a little more in detail. In regard to Assyria, while in the earliest form of the cuneiform, there was a resemblance though distant to the object presumed to be represented, every generation lessened the likeness until at length there was not the slightest suggestion of the original hieroglyph. As an example even when laid on its side has the faint suggestion of a "house"; it can also be understood how the figure of a "house," with four lines introduced, might suggest reduplication, and so a "great house"; but when the symbol becomes the resemblance has wholly disappeared. Another example may be adduced; as the rough suggestion of a foot, may quite naturally be used as the symbol for "to walk"; it might retain its suggestiveness even when laid on its side so ; but all resemblance has disappeared in of the later cuneiform. This difficulty is not lessened when a word written in this later cuneiform is developed ideographically; thus "water" placed within "mouth" becomes and means "to drink." To the end, ideograms intrude themselves into Assyrian, not infrequently drawn from Sumerian, at times representing not the idea but the sound of the Sumerian word. At the same time there were alphabetic signs representing the consonants. Even the earliest extant cuneiform inscriptions manifest a considerable divergence from the purely ideographic. The process implied must have involved a lengthened period of time of which there is no record.

In the case of Egypt the process is more under the eye of the observer. The artistic skill of the Egyptian people, and possibly the material they used, induced them to perpetuate their picture writing to a much later period, and in a much purer form than was the case in the valley of the Tigris and the Euphrates. Down to the times of the Roman emperors, sacred inscriptions were engraved in hieroglyph. Parallel with the hieroglyphic there were two other scripts, the "hieratic" and the "demotic." The former, the

"hieratic," is nearer the hieroglyphic; it was used for documents of importance, such as royal proclamations and sacred edicts. The other, further removed from the hieroglyphic, was used for more ordinary purposes, hence its name "demotic." The difference between these scripts is due to desire on the part of the scribe to write rapidly. It is interesting to observe the process by which the "demotic" was evolved. Thus *l* (or *r*) was represented in hieroglyphic by a lion couchant ; in the Prisse papyrus, that became ; in the later "hieratic" it became , and in the "demotic" . But throughout the whole process ancient Egyptian never became perfectly alphabetic; there were always occasions in which a word or a portion of a word would first be pictured and then spelt.

While the two great empires, the Assyrian and the Egyptian, bounded Palestine to the south and the north-east, there was on the north another powerful empire, the Hittite, the importance of which has been realised only in comparatively recent times. Still more recently have the many attempts at deciphering their inscriptions been crowned with anything like success. The writing of the Hittites is distinctly hieroglyphic; but while the Egyptian hieroglyphics were incised, those of the Hittites were carved in relief. Indeed, in every way there is the greatest contrast between the two systems of hieroglyph; the Hittite figures are coarsely drawn and of squat proportions, whereas elegant proportions and clear sharp outlines are the characteristics of those of the Egyptians. Another peculiarity of Hittite hieroglyph is that there is a much closer portraiture of the object which formed the hieroglyph, than is to be found in the idealised hieroglyphs of Egypt. The truth of what is here advanced may be seen on looking at the illustrations of Hittite inscriptions to be found in Wright's *Empire of the Hittites*, and elsewhere. Dr Sayce (Murray's *Dictionary of the Bible*, "Hittites") says that the Hittites only used hieroglyphics for monumental purposes, and instead of modifying them into a more current form for ordinary occasions, they adopted the Assyrian cuneiform.

The origin of the Semitic script in all its varieties has been sought in each of these modes of writing. The Semitic,

or as it is sometimes called the Phœnician script had an extensive vogue geographically; from the Taurus Mountains on the north it extended in various forms to Syene (Assouan) in the south, and from the banks of the Tigris on the east to Carthage and Marseilles on the west. The essential point in which the Semitic script differed from those of the great empires around was this; while they remained more or less hieroglyphic, it was from the first alphabetic. An approximation to this alphabetic stage had been made, as we have already seen, by all three languages above referred to; in regard to the Assyrian and Egyptian, this may be said with certainty, and in regard to the Hittite with a high degree of probability. The final step was taken of affixing one sign and one only to one sound and to one only, by one or other of the northern Semite races. This people evolved the alphabet, which in the names of the letters and the order in which they follow each other has been predominant in all essentials from the days of David and Solomon, if not earlier, down to the present time. Before the alphabetic writing was adopted correspondence in all the northern Semitic area seems to have been carried on in the cuneiform character and in the language of Babylon. Cumbrous as this mode of writing seems to us, it was not only used for official communications, as the Tell Amarna tablets show, but also for ordinary epistolary correspondence. At the same time it is relatively certain that the spoken language of Canaan, at the time when the Egyptian governors were corresponding with the chancellory of Khu-en-aten, was not Babylonian but a form of Hebrew. While this is so, the probability is that when they committed anything to writing, the script used would be cuneiform. Hence there is a plausibility in Colonel Conder's contention that in its earliest form the Pentateuch was not written, in the ordinary sense of the word, but was impressed in cuneiform characters on clay tablets with small chisels. Later in the year in which Conder published his book, *The First Bible*, Dr Otto Winckler advocated the same view in a magazine article. Since it has thus received German support this opinion is, according to Dr Sayce, that generally held. There is, however, a difficulty in allowing to this more than, at most, a

high degree of probability. It is not to be assumed as certain that in some elementary form the Semitic script was not known and used. The earliest examples of this mode of writing show that a long history of selection and simplification stands behind them. Centuries before Ahab reigned in Israel or Mesha in Moab the process must have begun, by which the script in question was evolved.

Whence was the Semitic script descended? Hommel (*Gesch. Bab. u. Assyr.*, pp. 50 ff.) maintains that it was derived from the cuneiform. In this there is no inherent improbability. Whatever province it was in which this script took its origin, it yet was one within the bounds of the ancient Babylonian Empire. It suits, too, with Hebrew tradition, which records that Abraham the ancestor of the Hebrew people came from Babylonia, from Ur of the Chaldees. The general vogue of the language is proved by the fact already noted that even when writing to the Egyptian king, whose officials they were, the Egyptian governors of Palestine wrote as we have seen in cuneiform characters and in the Babylonian language. When, however, it is tested letter by letter, Hommel's view is not confirmed. His additional opinion of how the step was taken is even less plausible. He thinks that some tribe of wandering Bedu struck with the wonders of writing, adopted the signs used by the Babylonians and simplified them into an alphabet. But the question as to who evolved the alphabet is quite different from the source from which it was evolved. Hommel chooses out eight characters as proving the source of the Hebrew alphabet to have been in Babylon. These are *alpu*, an "ox"; *bitu*, a "house" or "tent"; *gimmidu*, a "gift"; or *daltu*, a "door"; *katu*, or *idu*, a "hand"; *inu*, an "eye"; *nunu*, a "fish"; or *risu*, a "head." He adds other two as possible instances of derivation; *mi*, probably "water"; *e* of indeterminate meaning. The first of these eight first mentioned signs is not unlike *aleph*, since both are roughly drawn ideograms of the same object, but even so the Semitic does not seem to be derived from the Babylonian; it is drawn differently. In

regard to the second what resemblance there is, is distinctly fainter and suggests a different object; while the Babylonian symbol resembles a "booth," the Semitic suggests a "tent" . The form of the third letter in Babylonian is only like the later Maccabæan and the Samaritan form of the letter, not the earlier angular which is an attempt to indicate the head and neck of a "camel." Only the contracted form of the fourth has any resemblance to *daleth* in the angular, which is an attempt to indicate a "tent door," an object naturally triangular. Hommel's fifth example—the tenth letter of the Hebrew alphabet—appears to be the rough representation of the fingers of a hand; but still liker is it to the sign put on Moslem houses all over the nearer East, to avert the evil eye; the *yodh* of the angular script rather suggests the closed fist. Between the Babylonian *nunu* and the angular *nun* there does not seem to be much resemblance, though both having the same name must have been derived from the hieroglyph of a "fish." As to *inu*, an "eye," if it were reversed and set upon its apex, it would be almost identical with *ayin* in Samaritan; but is quite unlike the earlier form of the letter which is almost our "o," the letter which occupies the corresponding place in our alphabet. Still less is there any connection observable between Hommel's eighth example and the twentieth letter of the Semitic alphabet; if *rish* is the name of that sign it resembles not *resh* but *qoph*. The other two are really not to be taken into consideration at all. After all due estimate of the evidence, the resemblances and differences, etc., we feel ourselves, in regard to Dr Hommel's theory, obliged to come to a verdict of "not proven" with a distinct leaning towards a negative decision.

The theory advanced by Dr Rougé that the Semitic script was derived from Egypt has also considerable initial probability, though not so much as has that of Hommel. The Egyptians had made a closer approximation to the attainment of an alphabetic system than had the Babylonians. There was an intimate connection between Egypt and Palestine throughout the whole historic period. The lengthened stay of the people in Egypt would naturally

have led the Israelites to imbibe much of Egyptian culture. Still, Israel was only one branch of the Semite race, and not to appearance that with which the alphabet originated. The connection of Egypt with Palestine began long before the exodus of the Hebrews from the land of Egypt. For two generations the country had been, at the time when the Tell Amarna tablets were incised, under the dominion of Egypt. Certainly the tablets found in Tell Amarna are in cuneiform character and in the Babylonian tongue, as has been already stated; but though official diplomatic correspondence was carried on in Babylonian, as at present such correspondence in Europe is in French, it does not follow that the people, who certainly spoke a variety of Hebrew, wrote in cuneiform. From the advance made by the Egyptians towards a true alphabet, it might seem not at all unlikely that when the Canaanites were devising an alphabet they should be influenced by Egypt, and by the semi-alphabetic signs used by its people. Rougé wrote a book to prove the correctness of his theory of the dependence of the Semitic alphabet on Egyptian "demotic." He does not claim to have been the first to make this suggestion. In his book, to which reference has just been made, he surveys several of these systems according to which the Phœnician or Semitic alphabet was derived from Egypt. He goes back to antiquity to find support for his theory, and on the authority of Eusebius, quotes Sanchuniathon as attributing to Thoth, the son of Misor (Egypt), the invention of letters; this Rougé regards as indicating that there was a tradition among the Phœnicians that they had got their alphabet from Egypt. He, however, gives no indication of the process by which the Semitic was derived from the Egyptian. It is true M. Rougé lays down elaborate rules and principles on which it is necessary to proceed in deducing the Semitic signs from the Egyptian, and illustrates his scheme by numerous tables and figures. Yet a careful study of the evidence he adduces fails to produce conviction. Thus Rougé thinks that is derived from , but no resemblance can be perceived between this and the earliest form *aleph* assumes on the monuments, *e.g.*, and . Further this "demotic" form sprang

from the hieroglyph *a*, an "eagle"; the Hebrew word for an eagle is *nesher*, a word that does not contain the letter *aleph*, and therefore does not supply the required initial. In all the list there are only two letters where form and sound do at all support M. Rougé's contention. The Egyptian for an "owl" is *em* ; it becomes first and then which has some resemblance to , the form *mem* assumes on the ancient Semitic monuments, but the resemblance is far from striking. A more favourable example is *shehet*, "papyrus growing"; here form and sound agree with the Semitic *shin*. But both *mem* and *shin* are roughly drawn hieroglyphics, significant in the Semitic tongues; *mem* is a modification of *mayim*, "water," and its form on the Moabite Stone suggests this; *shin* is *shen*, a "tooth," and again the earliest form the letter takes is a rough delineation of a row of sharp teeth. This earliest form, instead of being liker its alleged Egyptian source, as seen on the Prisse papyrus, is much less so than that to be seen in the square character *shin* . In the "hieratic" and "demotic" scripts, the Egyptian form of *shehet* assimilates more to the Semitic *mem* than to *shin*. What resemblance there is, is merely fortuitous.

There remains Colonel Conder's theory that the Semitic alphabet was derived from the Hittites. In this case as in the others there is a certain initial plausibility in favour of the suggestion. The Hittite Empire would naturally impress itself on the mind and imagination of the whole northern portion of South-western Asia, the region wherein the alphabet with which attention is occupied sprang up. One of their subordinate capitals, Carchemish on the fords of the Euphrates, threatened to dominate the whole of Mesopotamia. On the west, the whole force of the Egyptian Empire had to be put forth under its greatest monarchs to prevent them holding in possession all Palestine. As far south as Hebron there was a colony of Hittites, with whom Abraham became confederate. This great and widespread influence would render plausible the theory which would seek the origin of what has been called the Phœnician alphabet in the signs of the Hittite syllabary. Colonel

Conder has, in his article on "Writing," in Murray's *Dictionary of the Bible*, expounded his theory at some length; only somewhat confusingly, in his table of "Comparative Alphabets," he replaces the term "Hittite" by "Syrian." His theory depends on the correctness of his transliteration of Hittite inscriptions; but nowhere has his system found acceptance. According to Colonel Conder, both the name of the letter and the object which its form indicated were drawn from the language of the Hittites. He maintains that *daleth* as the name of a letter does not signify a "door" but a "bucket," and sees a greater resemblance to that object than to a tent door in the triangle which represented the letter in the earliest inscriptions. The name for a skin bucket was in Hittite, according to Colonel Conder *daltu*, but skin buckets assume several shapes even if *daltu* be the Hittite word for it. Moreover, if one looks at the table given in "Murray," it is found that the parallel signs do not always suit, *e.g.*, the tenth symbol in the Hittite column seems decidedly more like the hieroglyphic source of the eleventh Semitic sign than of the tenth; on the other hand, the Hittite eleventh suggests the Hebrew tenth. Against this apparent plausibility which may be admitted with reservations is to be set the fact that the Hittite language was not alphabetic, and further it was not developed in the alphabetic direction even so far as was the Babylonian and Egyptian; for its cursive script it depended on Assyrian.

Thus it would seem to be impossible to deduce the Semitic script from any one of the suggested sources, the Babylonian, the Egyptian, or the Hittite. All three manifested a tendency towards becoming alphabetic, but each and all they stopped short of the final step. Who then took the step? The answer to this can only be found by interrogating the alphabet itself. As the people who invented the alphabet would primarily desire to inform their own people of their thoughts and wishes, the objects they would choose to employ as alphabetic signs would be those that were familiar. Hence we can deduce something of the habits of the nation from the objects with which they were constantly in contact.

Something may be deduced from the general character

of the symbols employed and the mode in which they are delineated. The presence of fine clay in the Mesopotamian valley suggested the use of tablets and of impressing the symbols on them by chisels; this led to a modification of the forms of the symbols. On the other hand, as we have seen, in Egypt the want of clay and the presence of the papyrus suggested the use of its pith as a substance to receive the graphic symbols. This led to the employment of a reed pen dipped in ink. This tended to modify the form of the symbols in another direction. From the angular shape assumed by the letters in the earliest instances of the Semitic script, they appear to have been scratched with an instrument having a hard sharp point on a surface of stone. This would exclude both Egypt and Mesopotamia, and point to the hilly district lying between the region of the two rivers and the Mediterranean as the dwelling of the inventors. The region would fit in with the suggestion of Hommel that it was the wandering Bedu who, impressed with the wonders of writing as they saw them in Babylon, adopted the idea, but modified and improved it into the alphabetic form. But the nomad had no motive to induce him to write; the tales and songs with which he and his friends entertained each other had been handed down by tradition in memory from his ancestors, and he was ready in his turn to convey them in the same way to his descendants; books would seem to him a useless encumbrance and writing a futile accomplishment. There were, however, traversing this desert tract of country, wanderers certainly but not unlettered Bedu, the Midianites, whose caravans conveyed the trade of Mesopotamia to Egypt and that of Egypt to Mesopotamia. Another people has been suggested, the Phœnicians; they, like the Midianites, were traders, and dwelt on the western edge of the region above indicated.

The geographical localisation of the inventors of the alphabet to which we have been led by considering the form of the letters and the medium used by the inventors, is confirmed by looking at the language or languages in giving permanence to which they were employed. This language is Aramaic, with its cognate Hebrew. The region occupied

by this language has been indicated above. It had flowed down into the rich plains of the land between the rivers. That the inhabitants of Babylonia and Assyria as far back as the time of Sargon spoke and wrote Aramaic is evidenced by the weights in his palace. On them, while on the one side is the formal legal inscription which recounts the names and titles of the sovereign in cuneiform, to which is added the statement of the weight, on the other in Aramaic is the simple statement of its relation to the *sheqel* whether part or multiple: on a British coin, on the one side the names and title of the king are given in Latin, and on the other in English the value of the coin. The docquet on the wrapper which contains a Babylonian contract table is usually in Aramaic, while the contract itself is in Babylonian. In Scotland, while up to the middle of last century certain documents necessary in the purchase of landed property were written in Latin and in black letter, the docquet was in English and written in the ordinary engrossing hand. From this it is clear that the ordinary language of the people was Aramaic even in Nineveh and Babylon, and the script commonly used was that of the Semitic peoples north and west of these cities. The script is the same in Sinjirli and on the Moabite Stone.

On the principle which has just been laid down, it will be advantageous to see what light is thrown on the origin of the Semitic alphabet by the objects from which the hieroglyphs behind the letters have been taken. The first letter, as has already been remarked, is *aleph* and means "an ox." In comparing the Semitic alphabet with the cuneiform, the resemblance has been noted which the figure had to the roughly drawn head of an ox—a likeness to be found in the script of the Cretan inscriptions. The ox was the animal most used in agriculture. The Laws of Hammurabi show how much importance was placed on agriculture in Babylonia. On the other side of the desert, the Phœnicians were regarded as such adepts in the art of husbandry that works on this subject were translated from Phœnician into Greek. If our supposition is correct that *beth* is intended to represent a "tent," this would indicate nomadic life; the form the letter assumes in Minoan might

suggest rather a built house, but the Minoan form is distinctly a secondary formation, whatever its actual date. The third letter *gimel*, which seems to be a rough portraiture of a camel's head and neck, carries a little further the suggestion of the alphabet originating with a nomadic people. The figure which Evans gives in the *Scripta Minoa* represents a human leg bent at the knee. This, however, proves only that to the Cretans, unfamiliar with the camel as they were, the sign for *gimél* suggested a bent knee; much as are the initial letters to chapters of illustrated books conjured into forming an illustration of what is coming. The common meaning of *daleth* is a "door"; from the triangular shape it is clearly a tent door that was in the mind of the artist. This also supports the nomadic origin of the alphabet.

If Gesenius is right in considering the name of the fifth letter, *he*, as connected with the exclamatory *he*, "behold," and in his further conjecture that it is intended to represent a "lattice" seen in profile, an upright with three sloping lines ⵎ represent with fair accuracy the slats of a lattice affixed to the upright side of the window. Sir Arthur Evans in the *Scripta Minoa* would connect it with *ḥeth*, of which he would regard it as a modification, and consequently would attach to it the same meaning; this, however, will be considered later under that letter. *Vav* the sixth letter means a "nail," a meaning borne out better by the corresponding letter in the Minoan script (*Scripta Minoa*, i., pl. vi.). This would suggest wooden structures and carpenters to erect such; but the form it assumes on the "Moabite Stone" and in the Siloam inscription ⵟ more naturally suggests a tent-peg, the division at the top indicating the crutch of a small branch, a thing very frequently used for this purpose. This harmonises more with the nomadic idea. The seventh letter *zain* has a name significant in Aramaic, Eastern and Western, but not in Hebrew; it means a "weapon." In the Baal-Lebanon inscription it is ‡ which has the suggestion of a feathered dart; the other and later forms, as on the Moabite Stone, appear to have resulted from emphasising the cross lines. The form of this letter found in Crete points to another weapon as that intended; it seems to have been a

double-headed battle-axe. (*Scripta Minoa*, pl. v., this form is also said to occur in South Semitic.) But as weapons were used equally by nomads and husbandmen no evidence is afforded as to which were the inventors. The eighth letter *heth* is usually held as meaning a "fence"; its form, two upright parallel lines joined by two or three horizontal ones, constant from the Ba'al-Lebanon inscription to the lettering on the Maccabæan coins, and but slightly modified in the Samaritan and in the script of Assouan, quite suits this. The root is not found either in Hebrew or in Aramaic, but in Arabic حَرَّطَ occurs which means "to surround with a fence." This points to enclosed fields and agricultural life: there is no suggestion of a "zareba" of cut thorns in any form the letter assumes. The ninth letter *teth* affords no evidence, as there is great dubiety as to the object intended to be represented.[1] The letters which follow, *yodh* and *kaph*, the "closed fist" and the "open palm," are not distinctive. This applies also to *ain*, *pe*, *qoph*, *resh*, and *shin*, as all representing parts of the body. *Lamed* an "ox-goad" suggests agriculture; *nun* a "fish" and *tzade* a "fish-hook," point to residence beside either the sea or a great river. In neither case is the implied hieroglyphic very evident; Hommel suggests as above noted that *nun* 𐤍 is derived from the Babylonian , but the line chosen does not seem to be suggestive of the original form. The sharpness of the angles at the turns in the figure precludes Sir Arthur Evans' suggestion of a "serpent." Unless it is intended to be a shorthand representation of a person fishing with a rod, the early form of *tzade* 𐤑 has no resemblance to a "fish-hook." The complete lack of any maritime symbols as a "ship" or an "oar" or a "sail" renders it more likely that the home of the inventors of the alphabet is to be found on the banks of the Tigris and the Euphrates, rather than on the seashore. The recent discoveries in Crete have led to the general acceptance of the opinion, strongly maintained by Sir Arthur Evans, that the alphabet which we have denominated Semitic really originated in the island kingdom of Minos. We

[1] The Minoan form certainly represents a chariot wheel and the Sinjirli shape is not unlike it, but the form on the Moabite Stone is less like it. The meaning of the word is uncertain.

do not think the proof which he advances at all convincing. The lack of any symbol, among those used as alphabetic, having a connection with maritime matters, militates also strongly against the Minoan claim to the origination of the alphabet. As the Minoan language is as yet unknown, there is no evidence that behind the signs were significant words the initial sounds of which were indicated. The picture of a house is unmistakable, but while *beth* is a "house" or "tent" in Semitic, there is no proof that the Minoans had a word for a house with the same initial.[1] The fact that one of the names is significant in Aramaic though not in Hebrew points in the same direction. The Phœnicians—the only rivals of the Aramæans—spoke Hebrew. The probability seems to be that it was one of the tribes that conveyed the produce of Assyria to Egypt and *vice versâ*, but who had their home in the high land overlooking Mesopotamia, and pursued agriculture in the intervals of trade, who invented the alphabet. It is to be observed that even yet the vowels were not expressed, the *ahevi* letters were only used for very exceptional circumstances when the vowel sounds were emphatic. In Semitic languages vowel sounds are somewhat indefinite, noticeably is this the case in regard to Arabic. It seems as if they regarded the vowels as a sort of indefinite sound-stuff modified by the consonants.

The order of the letters in the Semitic alphabet is not to be considered unimportant. The number of alphabetic poems, Psalms and others, in the limited Hebrew literature show the attention that was directed to this. In Ps. cxix. the alphabet is repeated in groups of eight verses, each of which begins with one letter. Besides this Psalm, there are seven other alphabets in the book of Psalms, one of these requiring two Psalms for its completion, Ps. ix. and x. Of these seven, only two are, in our present text, perfectly regular, cxi. and cxii.; these have this peculiarity that each letter is followed only by half a verse. While in our present text Ps. xxxvii. is defective as it wants the letter ע *ain*, in the Septuagint a verse occurs, omitted in the Massoretic, which supplies the missing letter. The remain-

[1] This question is discussed more fully in Appendix III.

ing four alphabets in the Psalms are defective. Ps. ix. and x. appear to have been intended to form together one alphabet, but in the first of these *daleth* is omitted, and in Ps. x. the verses which follow the lamed verse on to the twelfth are not alphabetic. It would be beside the present argument to dwell on the other instances. The book of Lamentations has four alphabets; three of these are irregular by transposing *ain* and *pe*. The alphabet which occurs in Prov. xxxi. is normal. When these poems were written the order of the letters was fixed. As most of the Psalms written in this style are attributed to David, the order of the alphabet must have been regarded as very old. Whether Jeremiah wrote the book of *qinoth* (Lamentations) or not, the book is certainly old; if not pre-exilic, it was written under the agony of the exile; though three out of the four alphabetic poems have the slight irregularity above referred to, the evidence for the common order furnished by the general agreement greatly outweighs this.

Another sign of the fixity in the order of the letters of the alphabet, and the importance attached to it, is the use made of it in cryptic writing. For instance, there was *athbash* in which the last letter of the alphabet was put for the first, and the second last for the second, and so on through the alphabet; an example of this is to be found in Jer. xxv. 26 and li. 41, in which ששך *Sheshak* stands for בבל *Babel*. Another of these cryptic modes of writing is called *albam;* in it the alphabet was divided into two, and the first letter of the alphabet was put for the twelfth, the second for the thirteenth, and *vice versâ;* an example of this is supposed by Rashi to be found in Is. vii. 6, "the son of Tabeal" really standing for "the son of Remaliah," as the "son of Tabeal" was an utterly unknown person. All these devices implied that the order of the alphabet was fixed. The device of giving numerical values to the several letters according to their place in the alphabet implies the same fixity; only the date at which this came into use cannot be determined. The Phœnicians had separate signs for numbers, as may be seen on the Sarcophagus of Ashmunazar. On the Maccabæan coins letters are regularly used for numerals.

Since the order of the alphabet had become fixed, and

this order had come to be looked upon with something akin to reverence, it might be expected that there would be some principle behind it. There do seem to be at least traces of a systematic arrangement. In the first four letters, א ב ג ד, there is first a weak letter, then a labial, then a guttural in the English use of the word, and last a dental. Further, the latter three are mutes. In the group of letters which follows we have a similar succession, with this difference that in the third place there is a sibilant. The letters of this group would, were they English letters, be called aspirated, with the exception of the last, ט *teth*, which is the hardest of the linguals, or to use another nomenclature, the dentals. Singularly enough, *theta*, the letter which in the Greek alphabet occupies its place is an aspirated letter. Another peculiarity which suggests itself is that the sibilant ז *zain* has among sibilants the flat sound associated with mutes. A possible reason for excluding *zain* from the first group was that if it occupied the third place it made with *beth* the ill-omened word בֻּז *buz*, "contempt," and the equally ill-omened word בָּז *baz*, "a prey." Again, the aspirated sibilant ש *shin*, if placed in the third place among the aspirates, made with the following letters the ill-omened שָׁחַט *shaḥaṭ*, "to slay." This might be the reason why the first group of letters has no sibilant, and why *shin* is relegated to the end of the alphabet. As a last group we have the weak letter *ain*—in Samaritan it is a "servile" letter—the *pe* a labial, next *tzade* a sibilant, *qoph* a guttural, and last of all *tau* a dental. The arrangement followed in the liquid group may have been the result of intrusion from another alphabet which began with the liquids. The Romans seem to have originally had such an alphabet, and hence called the letters *elementa*. The letter ר *resh* was probably the last to be added to the list of letters. The Egyptians made no distinction between it and *l*. The Japanese and the Chinese are under the same disability at the present time. The intrusion of the *elementa* appears to have wrought disorder in the process of the symmetrical evolution of the alphabet, so far as the middle portion of it is concerned. It is not unlikely that the primitive form of the alphabet had been long enough known for the phrase

to come into use, which made *aleph* and *tau* stand for the beginning and end of anything. If this were so, there would be a reason why *shin* when displaced, and *resh* when received into the alphabet, should neither of them be placed after *tau*.

This is to be taken merely as an attempt to investigate the principles that might have underlain the order of the letters in the Semitic alphabet. It is impossible to say when the process was completed. If the correctness of the tradition which attributes to David the majority of the alphabetic Psalms may be assumed, then in his days the alphabet had already long attained its present fixed order. In that case, the process of arranging and rearranging must have taken place in the preceding centuries. Not impossibly these alterations might in some part have been the work of the Phœnicians, who would be under the necessity of recording their transactions in a form in which the terms of them might readily be recalled. If there actually was an *elementary* alphabet used by any of the nations of the Mediterranean basin, they would be the most likely to come into contact with it.

As we have already indicated, the Semitic alphabet underwent several modifications in the course of its long history. Of the time when these changes took place, or the place where they did so, there is no indication. The earliest inscriptions give the impression that they stand at the end of a long process. Within the period of which we have inscriptions a process of modification may be traced. The most ancient specimens of this script have been incised on stone or scratched on metal; the Sinjirli inscriptions, however, are exceptions, they are carved in relief. The incising tends to emphasize the sharpness of the angles. These angles are not so sharp in Sinjirli, as the chisel in leaving the letters in relief would be liable to remove the points of the angles. Even when incised the letters had a tendency to become curved; this may be seen by comparing the *lamed* on the Ba'al-Lebanon fragment with the same letter in the Siloam inscription. There was thus probably, alongside of the monumental writings, engrossing with reed or stylus on some less recalcitrant material than

rock or stone. This angular script lasted till close upon the time of Alexander the Great. The latest extant example of this script is the inscription on the sarcophagus of Ashmunazar which is generally dated at approximately 400 B.C.

The earliest inscription as yet known which has been preserved, has been scratched on the fragments of a bronze bowl found in Cyprus. It has been dedicated to a deity called Ba'al-Lebanon by one who denominates himself the "servant of Hiram King of the Sidonians." If we may identify this Hiram with the friend of Solomon the date of the inscription would be about 950 B.C.[1] The next important inscription is that on the *stele* of Mesha, King of Moab. As Mesha was the younger contemporary of Ahab, the date of his inscription may be set down as approximately 850 B.C. The excavations that took place in the foundations of Ahab's palace have brought to light jar handles and ostraka, with inscriptions in the same script. The series of inscriptions found in Sinjirli extend over a considerable period; but as Panammu, who writes the most important of them, describes himself as the servant of Tiglath-Pileser, the probable date of his inscription is a hundred years later than that of Mesha, about 750 B.C. The last inscription to which reference may be made in this connection is that found in the conduit in Siloam. As the conduit in which it was found had been made by the order of Hezekiah under fear of the invasion of Sennacherib, its date can be pretty definitely assigned to 700 B.C.

A comparison of the alphabets (p. 222) shows an increasing tendency to prefer curved lines to straight ones, and to soften sharp angles into curves. This means the growing influence of scribal writing on the script of the epigraphist. Another symptom of the same influence is the preference for a continuous line over a broken one. These tendencies

[1] One of the leaders, along with Hezekiah, of the rebellion against Sennacherib, was Luli of Tyre, "king of the Sidonians" (Winckler, *Babylonia and Assyria*, p. 256, Eng. Trans.). It is evident then that a "King of Tyre" might at the same time be "King of the Sidonians"—when Tyre held the hegemony among Phœnician cities, the Tyrian king would be King of the Sidonians.

Samaritan Name	Hebrew Name	Baal Lebanon	Moabite Stone 850 BC	Siloam 706 BC	Assouan 400 BC	Ashmunazer	Maccabean 100 BC	Samaritan	Square 200 AD	Samaritan M.S later
Alaf	Aleph									
Bit	Beth									
Gaman	Gimel									
Dalath	Daleth									
I	He									
Bar	Vav									
Zen	Zain									
It	Heth									
Tit	Teth									
Yud	Yodh									
Kaf	Kaph									
Labad	Lamed									
Mim	Mem									
Nun	Nun									
Simcat	Samech									
In	Ain									
Fi	Pe									
Tzade	Tzadi									
Kof	Koph									
Rish	Resh									
Shin	Shin									
Taf	Tav									

Table Showing Script of Semitic Languages.

may be clearly seen if the *beth* of the Ba'al-Lebanon inscription, or that on the stone of Mesha be compared with examples of that letter in the inscription on the sarcophagus of Ashmunazar. In the earlier examples the letter is built up of four straight lines; but in the inscriptions on the sarcophagi of Ashmunazar and of his father Tabnit, it is formed of one curved line. The letter *daleth* exhibits the same tendency, though in a less degree. The preference of the scribe for continuous lines over broken ones may be seen in the way the letter *qoph* varies from a circle with a line through it, as it appears in the Ba'al-Lebanon inscription, to the circular curve ending in a straight line found in that of Siloam, and finally to the yet more dashing curve by which the letter is delineated on the sarcophagi of Sidon. One letter, *mem*, does not exhibit this progress towards a form which admitted of more rapid writing; its last form implies the use of more strokes than did the earlier. It will be observed that the forms which some of the letters assume in the Siloam inscription differ much from those which these letters have in other nearly contemporary inscriptions, *aleph*, *gimel*, *vav*, and *tzade* being marked instances. This may be due to local influences; the *mem* assimilates somewhat to the Sidonian form. Both *aleph* and *beth* seem to be to some extent anticipations of the later forms of the Maccabæan coins and the Samaritan inscriptions. The Ashmunazar inscription shows several peculiarities, which it may be observed are also to be found in the slightly earlier inscription on the sarcophagus of Tabnit. The *gimel* has a shape which has none of the suggestion so obvious in Mesha's inscription, of the head and neck of a camel, and becomes almost identical in form with the Greek *lambda; zain* has no longer any resemblance to a dart as in the Ba'al-Lebanon inscription, as little to the Minoan double battle-axe, but has become very like the Greek *zeta*. The use of *zain* to indicate the ends of sentences and occasionally of words is to be noted; this is a peculiarity found on several Sidonian inscriptions as on that of Jehomelek, King of Gebal. The most noticeable change is to be seen in the letter *yodh*, which has assumed a shape closely akin to that met with in Samaritan MSS.; sometimes it is

almost exactly like the letter *shin* turned upside down. The shape of *samech* is also peculiar, but its genesis from the form earlier prevalent is easily intelligible, the desire to lighten the labour of writing by making the line continuous. The most remarkable variation is to be found in the letter *tau*. Instead of the simple cross as seen on the Moabite Stone and in the Siloam inscription, and as figured by Evans in the *Scripta Minoa*, the letter in most of the Phœnician inscriptions is formed of an upright line sloping slightly to the right at the top; near the top on the right of the upright there is a little hook turning downwards. A similar form is found on a weight figured in Lidzbarski (*Nord. Sem. Epig. Tfl.*, xxvi. 1) brought from Asia Minor and dated by him fifth century B.C. It is to be observed that the *lamed* in the Phœnician shows a marked tendency towards the shape it assumed in the Samaritan. The Sidonian script is thus a preparation for that of the Maccabæans and the Samaritans.

After the inscription on the sarcophagus of Ashmunazar, the next specimens of Hebrew script are the inscriptions on the Maccabæan coins. The earliest of these was struck in the pontificate of Simon, the last survivor of the sons of Mattathias. More than a quarter of a millennium separates the date of Ashmunazar from that of Simon the Maccabee; during the interval a complete change has passed over the character of Hebrew writing. The script of the Maccabæans, for inscriptions on coins, remained for the most part unchanged to the time of Bar-Cochba. To the casual observer the Maccabæan resembles that to be found in the older Samaritan MSS. This likeness is confirmed by a circumstance related by Moses ben Naḥman (1194) of himself; he found in Akka a coin with an inscription which he could not read himself, but which he got some Samaritans resident there to read for him. At the same time a comparison between the two scripts shows that though they are very like they are by no means identical. When both are compared with the later Sidonian it is seen that while in some points the Maccabæan differs less from the later Phœnician than does the Samaritan, in some other points the resemblance between the Samaritan and the later Phœnician

is greater. That there should be very considerable difference is only to be expected; from Ashmunazar to the earliest Maccabæan coins is, as has just been said, an interval of more than two centuries and a half; from the latest coins of Bar-Cochba to the earliest Samaritan inscription is a period at least as long; from that to the earliest manuscript of unquestioned date is probably twice or thrice as long a space of time. Though on the Jewish coins the forms of most of the letters remain unchanged from the accession of Simon to the death of Bar-Cochba, a period of 270 years, yet one or two of the letters have been modified, notably 𐤄 *he*, 𐤅 *vav*, 𐤑 *tzade*, and 𐤒 *qoph*, as may be seen on the table.

If the script of the earlier of the Samaritan codices now to be found in the libraries of Europe and America is compared with that of the few Samaritan inscriptions extant, it will be found that, considering the difference between writing with a reed on parchment or paper, and engraving with a chisel on a limestone slab, the characters are practically identical; yet the period from the engraving of the one to the writing of the other was, as stated above, nearly three-quarters of a millennium. This fixity of script is a phenomenon to be observed. Within the same time the Jewish writing of Hebrew had evolved the square character, which is found in our Hebrew Bibles, the Rabbinic or Rashi character, and still later, the cursive script. Why the Samaritans selected the particular script they have, and conserved that with such tenacity is difficult to explain. It has to be admitted that within the last century a deterioration has set in, as may be seen on the table in the second column of Samaritan.

As already remarked, the present Samaritan script was the result of evolution. It has been noted that it has a double affinity, to the later Sidonian on the one hand, and on the other to the Maccabæan. When looked at more closely it is seen that in regard to nine letters there is greater resemblance on the part of the Samaritan to the Maccabæan. In the case of six of these, *aleph*, *beth*, *daleth*, *mem*, *nun*, and *tau*, the resemblance is obvious and applies to the whole Maccabæan period; in regard to other three, *gimel*, *caph*, *lamed*, the resemblance is only to the script on the later

coins. In the case of four letters the Samaritan form is more akin to that on the Sidonian sarcophagi, that is, *he*, *yodh*, *ḥeth*, *qoph;* of these the most striking is *yodh*, which in the Maccabæan is like the *he* of the Samaritan script, with the lower bar turned to the right instead of to the left, thus resembling the form it has on the Moabite Stone. In the Samaritan as in the Sidonian the *yodh* is, so to say, thrown on its face. The *ḥeth* of the Maccabæan coins closely resembles the same letter on the Siloam inscription. The *qoph* of Samaritan inscriptions and manuscripts is formed in the same way as that on the Sidonian sarcophagi; while that on the Maccabæan coins has quite a different genesis. The upright shape of the Maccabæan letter makes it more akin to the earlier forms, though most of them have a cursive look awanting in the Maccabæan. With regard to *resh*, the Maccabæan coins figure that letter occasionally, with a slight inclination to the left of the foot of the upright as if a line were starting from thence; in the Samaritan MSS. this is clearly drawn, but it does not appear in the epigraphic form of the letter. While the *shin* of the Samaritan inscriptions resembles closely that on the Ashmunazar sarcophagus, the manuscript form differs from it considerably. There are seven letters whose form is peculiar to the Samaritans: *vav*, *zain*, *ṭeth*, *samech*, *ain*, *pe*, *tzade*. In the case of four of these there are no Maccabæan examples extant, viz., *zain*, *ṭeth*, *samech*, and *pe;* in regard to these it may well have been that, as in the case of the nine letters first mentioned, the resemblance between them and the Samaritan was also great. One point may be noted: the form of *vav* found on the Samaritan inscriptions must have been that conveyed by the Sidonians to Greece, as may be seen from the shape of the *digamma*, which is perpetuated in our own letter F.

It is clear from the above comparison that the Samaritan script closely resembled that used by the Jews in the time of the Maccabees, and that both scripts differed considerably from the earlier angular script found all over South-western Asia. While the Jewish scribes modified the script which they used, influenced possibly by their intercourse with Egypt, until at length the square character resulted with which all are familiar, the Samaritans retained the more epigraphic

style which had been common at the time of the Maccabæan struggle. There must have been some reason which rendered this form of the Semitic script in a manner sacrosanct to them. It must have been some occurrence which associated a document written in that script, presumably a copy of the Divine Torah, with a crisis in their religious history. As the script of the Maccabæan coins underwent some changes, slight but definite, it may be possible to find some indication of the approximate date when the manuscript was written which has dominated the later Samaritan script. In comparing the earlier and later forms of the letters on the Maccabæan coins it will be seen that the most striking change is in the letter *he*. On the coins of Simon the Maccabee the letter assumes a form like a Roman E reversed—a form between that on the Sidonian sarcophagi, and that on the Samaritan inscriptions. With the coins of John Hyrcanus a markedly different form appears, one that is in a sense a precursor of the coming square character. Another letter in which there is a difference of earlier and later is *vav*. A form figured in Madden (*Hist. Jew. Coinage*, pp. 43, 44) has an upright, curving a little to the left at the top, and about the middle a line passing through the upright; the coins on which this form appears are dated first, second, and third years of Simon. This shape is closely akin to what is to be found in Samaritan MSS. and still more to the epigraphic form. With Simon's fourth year of coinage another shape appears, a perpendicular surmounted by the letter *z*. As has been remarked, it must have been from a form cognate to the first of these that the Greek *digamma* and our Roman F have sprung. The letter *yodh* on the Simonian coins resembles at once the shape that letter has on the Sidonian sarcophagi and that on the Samaritan inscriptions. The coins of John Hyrcanus show that letter in a form not unlike our *z*; later coins show it like that on the Moabite Stone. This points to the script which has become consecrated among the Samaritans as dating from the earlier portion of the pontificate of Simon the Maccabee. This would be explained if a copy of the Torah written in that script had been preserved, in a way so marvellous that it seemed miraculous, in the temple of Mount Gerizim, during one of the numerous occasions in

which that temple had been burned. The most celebrated of these was that, when John Hyrcanus, as related by Josephus, conquered Samaria, destroyed the city, conquered Shechem (Nablus), and burned the temple on Mount Gerizim "two hundred years after it was built." Such manuscripts as were preserved in the temple would not, at least most of them, have been recently penned. Hence, if one MS. was saved from the conflagration, that it should have been written during the pontificate of Simon or even earlier is by no means improbable. This, however, is not to say that the present Nablus Roll is the MS. so saved.

The Jews admit the Samaritan script to be older than the *Ashurith* which they now use. The Talmudic account of this (*San.*, pp. 21*b*, 22*a*) is as follows: "The law was first given to Israel in the *'Ibri* character and the holy tongue; again it was given in *Ashurith* writing and the Syrian tongue. The Israelites chose the *Ashurith* writing and the holy tongue, and left to the *Hediotæ* the *'Ibri* writing and the Syrian tongue. Who are the *Hediotæ?* Rabbi Chasda says 'the Cuthæans' (the Samaritans)." It is to be observed that the Talmudists made no distinction between the script of Samaria and that yet earlier found on the Moabite Stone. It is a proof of the extreme conservatism of the Samaritans that for so many centuries they have not altered their mode of writing. Although the Jews changed their script repeatedly the Samaritans did not imitate them. The Samaritans claimed to have worshipped JHWH from the days of Esarhaddon, and their claim was not disallowed; they must have had some ritual and liturgy; is it likely that they, so conservative in regard to the writing used in the Torah, would change all that at the bidding of a priestly scribe who refused even to have their assistance in rebuilding the temple, and regarded intermarriage with them as equivalent to marriage with heathen? At the same time it must be remembered that this Jewish tradition concerning the date of the introduction of the square character is certainly incorrect. The square character was not introduced for more than half a millennium after Ezra.

But besides the characters there are other peculiarities of Samaritan writing. In Hebrew inscriptions of the age of

the Antonines the writing is continuous, as in the Bni Hezir inscription and in that at Kefr Bir'im; there is nothing to mark the termination of a word or sentence. In earlier specimens, as in the Mesha inscription, that in Siloam, and those in Sinjirli, a dot is inserted between each word. This peculiarity is to be observed in all Samaritan MSS. and also in the inscriptions; in the latter it is a *colon* that frequently appears rather than a period. The Samaritans thus seem to have perpetuated an ancient mode of separating words which had been abandoned by the Jews. Sentences in Samaritan MSS. are marked off by *colons*, and the end of paragraphs is shown by three or four dots reinforced by a line, sometimes placed horizontally, sometimes standing perpendicularly.

Another peculiarity of Samaritan writing, which points to development on lines independent of the Jews, is the way Samaritan scribes took to make the lines of writing fit exactly over each other. In the inscription of Mesha, King of Moab, the lines, except at the circular top, terminate approximately over each other; when, however, the line ends in the middle of a word, as happens in regard to the very first line of that inscription, the word is completed in the next, irrespective of syllables. In more recent Hebrew MSS. the device of *literæ dilatabiles*, letters that might be elongated, was used to fill up the line to the margin in such a way that there should be no words left unfinished to be continued in the line following. The way the Samaritan scribes attained the same end was different: they left a space, larger or smaller as might be needed, before the margin was reached, and passing over this space combined the last two, or sometimes the last three, letters of the last word into a group close up to the margin. When the end of a paragraph was reached no attempt was made to fill up the line; an arrangement of dots and lines indicates that it has terminated. In most manuscripts there is at the end a separate paragraph generally short, in which the scribe informs the reader of his identity, when and where he wrote. In this, too, the Samaritan scribes had a method of their own. A page or two before the end of the manuscript the column was split for the breadth of rather more than a letter; this

space was ruled off by lines drawn with a stylus; one or two letters of a word may be on one side of this space and the rest of it on the other. When the eye is carried down the column every now and then a letter is intruded into the space otherwise left blank. It is soon observed that these letters are formed into groups, marked off by a tiny line. It is further noticed that these groups form words, and if read continuously the words join into a sentence or sentences. These sentences convey the information usually found in a colophon, and constitute what is technically called the *tarîkh;* it contains the name of the scribe, it may be also the name of him at whose instance the manuscript has been written, the place where and the date when it was penned; the latter stated according to the years "of the rule of the children of Ishmael," that is to say, "el Hegira." There are several other peculiarities of writing; as they have no vowel signs, words might sometimes be ambiguous, thus אל may mean "God" or "not," according as it is vocalised; so when it means "God" a line is placed over it. This also is done when a word is shortened.

The most ancient form of books appears to have been rolls. In Nablus there are several rolls of the Torah, including the one which the Samaritans claim to have been written by Abishua, the great-grandson of Aaron. The numerous manuscripts in Europe and America are all codices or made up in book form. They are made of vellum, parchment, or paper. One thing the Samaritan scribes are very particular about in all these codices is that the writing should begin on the right-hand page. In this way there is always a blank page to the outside. The most of the codices are in folio, but not a few are in quarto; the famous copy in Paris, which Pietro della Valle brought to Europe, and by it renewed the knowledge of the Samaritan Pentateuch, is a quarto.

Most of the codices are written in parallel columns, two columns on the page. Generally the one column contains the Hebrew text while the other has the Samaritan Aramaic Targum; sometimes instead of the Aramaic there is the Arabic version. In one manuscript there are three columns on the page, Hebrew, Aramaic, and Arabic. It ought to be

noted that almost in every case, even in the case of the interpretation being in Arabic, the character used is Samaritan.

After considering the mode of writing it is needful to attend for a little to the mode of reading; the letters written may be the same but may be very differently pronounced. This possibility is made obvious when one hears a passage of classic Greek read first by an English scholar and then by a modern Greek. In such a case it will be seen that not merely are the vowels differently pronounced, which is the difference between the Latin of Scotland and that of England, but that many of the consonants, as pronounced by the one, would be unintelligible to the other. The primary source of this difference was the pronunciation of the letters of the Greek alphabet adopted by Erasmus, whose teaching England received in this matter, the vocalic differences being caused by the change in vowel values in England itself. The state of matters in Palestine, when Ezra arrived there from Persia, was in regard to Hebrew not unlike that in Europe in regard to Greek at the time of the Revival of Letters. Hebrew had become practically a dead language, it had ceased to be the language ordinarily spoken; Aramaic had dispossessed it. If the Samaritans had not the Torah till it was brought them by Manasseh, in Ezra's recension, they would have no traditional mode of reading Hebrew. If they received the Torah from Ezra through Manasseh they would also have received the Jewish mode of reading it. With Semitic conservatism they might have been expected to have perpetuated this. With the Jews the consonantal pronunciation of Hebrew is the same whether the Jews who speak it are Russian or Spanish. From this it may be deduced that the primitive sounds of all the consonants have been fairly well preserved. It might be thought that Origen's transliteration, where that has been preserved, might have shown how Hebrew was pronounced in his day; but the uncertainty as to the way in which Greek was then pronounced renders this less available. The transliteration of proper names gives some information; it is obvious from these that the Hebrew of that time was not wholly devoid of gutturals; such names as Ἀχαάβ, "Ahab," and Ὀχυζίας, "Ahaziah,"

prove this. If it may be presumed that the modern Greek pronunciation of *gamma* was that in use in Alexandria at the time when the Septuagint was translated; we learn that *ain* in Hebrew had, like the same letter in Arabic, a double pronunciation, consequently sometimes represented by the simple vowel and sometimes by *gamma;* compare עָמוֹס Αμώς, "Amos," and עַזָּה Γάξα, "Gaza"; in Arabic the first is *ain* the second *ghain.* It is clear that Hebrew as pronounced by the Jews had the gutturals.

One marked peculiarity of the way in which the Samaritans pronounce Hebrew is that they drop all the gutturals, or which is the same thing, pronounce them all as *aleph.* This peculiarity explains not a few of the variations of the Samaritan recension of the Pentateuch from the Massoretic. A singular result of this may be observed; not a few of the Samaritan alphabetic poems begin not with *aleph* but with *ain.* Benjamin of Tudela, as mentioned in an earlier chapter, found that in his day they had the same disability. This Samaritan peculiarity is a thing which itself needs an explanation. Reference has been made to the ordinary English pronunciation of Latin; the explanation of that is simple, all the vowel and consonantal sounds are harmonised to English usage. The same thing applies *mutatis mutandis* to the German way of pronouncing Latin. In every case the tendency is to assimilate the pronunciation of the dead language to that of the living language of the people. But in the present case the language of the people is Arabic, a language which is even richer in gutturals than Hebrew. The Samaritan pronunciation of Hebrew so far from being assimilated to Arabic is in direct and absolute contrast to it. The fact that Arabic is a language closely cognate with Hebrew makes this resistance to a natural tendency all the more striking. It is only to be explained by the conservatism that is connected, especially in the East, with everything related to religion or worship. Since the Samaritans neither received nor perpetuated the Jewish pronunciation of Hebrew, they must themselves have had a customary pronunciation of that language. This would seem to imply that they had the Torah before the days of Ezra.

There is a fact which has a bearing on this subject. The

Assyrians and Babylonians spoke a North-Semitic language, cognate to Hebrew; they, like the Samaritans, assimilated most of their gutturals to *aleph*. It has been sometimes asserted that all the gutturals were so assimilated; but this was not the case, for they had the strong guttural ח *ḥeth*, as proved by such names as Sennacherib (Σαναχάριβος, Herod. ii. 141)[1]; the Greek transliteration here shows that the guttural was pronounced. Had the statement been absolute it might have been maintained, that this assimilation of the gutturals with *aleph* by the Samaritans was merely the perpetuation in Palestine by the colonists of the mode of speech which they had used in their own original land, and which they applied to the reading of Hebrew. But not only is it not accurate as to Assyrian, the colonists spoke not the monumental Assyrian but Aramaic, which retained the gutturals.

Another fact, however, has to be noted. The language of Phœnicia was Hebrew: the tradition is generally admitted to be correct that the Phœnicians gave Greece the alphabet. It is clear that when they conveyed it to Greece they had ceased to pronounce the gutturals. As the Phœnician alphabet had no signs for the vowels and had no sounds for four of their signs, the Greeks put vowels into all these vacant places; so *aleph* became α, *a*, *he* became ε (short *e*), *ḥeth* became η (long *e*), and *ain* became ο (short *o*). It was not that the Greeks were without gutturals in their speech; they had to add to the Kadmean alphabet four supplementary letters, one of which was χ *chi*, equivalent to *ḥeth* of the Semitic alphabet. Another of the gutturals they represented by the rough breathing. To some extent *gamma* later had a sound akin to *ain;* this, however, was a later development of Hellenic phonetics. As the Phœnician alphabet is found in the Minoan remains in Crete (*Scripta Minoa*, pp. 88, 89), it must have been conveyed thither not later than 1400 B.C. (Leaf, *Homer and History*, p. 39), centuries before the building of Solomon's Temple. The introduction of this fashion of assimilating the gutturals to *aleph*, akin to the English inability to pronounce *ch* in "loch," might set in with the affinity made by the House of

[1] The name appears in the Septuagint as Σενναχηρίμ.

Omri with the royal family of Tyre. This would explain how it was that while the North dropped the gutturals the Southern tribes retained them. Hence it would follow that, at all events from the time of Ahab, the Israelites of the North read Hebrew in a way not unlike that in which the Samaritans now do, and therefore would read the Torah so, if they had it. This would be perpetuated if the priests sent by Esarhaddon brought the Torah with them. If the Samaritans got the Sacred Law from Jerusalem in Hebrew—a language which had ceased to be spoken—why did they not adopt the Jewish mode of reading it? Manasseh would read the Law as the Jews did. The Galilæans seem to have had the same peculiarity as had the Samaritans, hence Peter's speech betrayed him in the court of the High Priest's house.

In regard also to the *begadhkephath* letters, those that were regarded as aspirated unless they had the *daghesh lene*, the Samaritans, now at any rate, are subject to a certain amount of disability. Of these letters they only aspirate *beth* and *pe;* the others they always pronounce as if *dagheshed.* The Jews of the time when the Septuagint was translated appear to have had no difficulty in regard to the aspiration of the "dentals." In fact they aspirated them more frequently than they ought to have done, if the extant rules are to be regarded as then binding; not only have we "Japheth" but also "Thogarma." There is no distinct indication of the date at which this inability began, hence it is not of so great importance. It may be noted that all foreign Jews labour under the same disability, even those in Damascus. This may be largely due to their surroundings in the case of Jews in Teutonic or Romance countries. It has, however, little bearing on the present argument.

Petermann in his valuable *Hebræische Formenlehre nach der Aussprache der heutigen Samaritaner* (p. 4) says: "Earlier the Samaritans had several books in which the rules for reading Hebrew were set down; but according to the assurance of the High Priest these have been lost. Now there are only fragments of a book entitled *Qanūn ibn Dartha f'lmaqra*, 'Qanun son of Dartha on reading,' and fragments of a commentary on it." Dr Petermann at the conclusion of

the book above referred to has given a transliteration of Genesis as it is read by the Samaritans at the present time. We subjoin the first five verses of the first chapter of Genesis:—

(1) *Barashet bara eluwêm it ashshamêm wit aaretz.* (2) *Waaretz ayata te'u ub'u waashek al fani tûm urû eluwêm amra'efat al fani ammêm;* (3) *uya'umer eluwêm yai ôr uyai ôr;* (4) *uyere eluwêm it a'ôr kitôv, uyebdel eluwêm bîn a'ôr ubîn aashek;* (5) *uyiqra eluwêm la'ôr yôm ulaashek qara lila uyai erev uyai beqar yôm aad.*

CHAPTER IX

THE LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE OF THE SAMARITANS

It is generally recognised that the language of a people reveals much of its history; thus Dr Max Müller saw the pastoral life of our Aryan ancestors proved by the fact that the root from which the words for "money," "wealth" in so many tongues springs, is ultimately connected with cattle, as *pecunia* from *pecu*, "cattle," and portrays the idyllic scene of the primitive household in which the "daughter" (*duhitar*) is the milkmaid, and the "brother" (*brahtar*) is ready to help. Not merely is there revealed the primitive condition of society in which a language arose, but also something of national history may be culled from the predominant words used by a people. The close political relations maintained between Scotland and France, over against England, may be evidenced by the number of French words, names of common things, that are or were in use in Scotland but unused in England. Another example is pointed out by Sir Walter Scott in *Ivanhoe*, as shown by "ox" and "beef," "sheep" and "mutton," "calf" and "veal." When the animals in question were in the fields and under the charge of their herds they had Teutonic names, but when they became viands on the tables of the masters of those herds they received French names. This is evidence that there was a race of serfs who spoke a Teutonic tongue ruled by a race of nobles who spoke a variety of French. But the last of these examples shows that such evidence can go deeper; that the word for the flesh of the calf is "veal" not "veau," proves that the conquest had taken place after the "t" in *vitulus* had dropped out of speech, but before

the "l" had been in speech commuted into "u"; that is to say between the ninth and the fifteenth century. But the English language as a whole proves something more; its Teutonic structure, and the majority of its commonest words having an Anglo-Saxon origin prove that though the majority of the words of its vocabulary are Romance, the Teutonic element was ultimately the predominant.

In making historical deductions from the phenomena of language, several things have to be borne in mind. While a word borrowed has to submit to the laws which regulate the development of the language into which it has been introduced, the language from which it has been taken has been changing also; thus, in the word "mutton" the "l" that was sounded in it when the word came to England was commuted in this country into "t" and in France into "u," as in "mouton." Hence, in making deductions from words in one language to words of the same root in another, these laws must be taken into account. Further mere isolated examples must not have any stress laid on them, as the peculiarity which such a case exhibits may be due to some accidental circumstance, and prove no general tendency. We have dwelt all the longer on this as the argument in the present chapter will be based on the phenomena of language, and there is no work so far as we are aware which deals with the logic of language, save in the most general way.

In considering the evidence for the history of the Samaritan religion, and of its relation to that of the Jews, to be derived from the successive languages used by the Samaritan people, Arabic may be put aside. The Samaritan community is too small—it would take but a small village to accommodate them—to have any reaction. They are totally submerged in the Arabic speaking population around. It is nearly thirteen centuries since, by the victory in the battle of Jarmuk, the land of Palestine passed from under the rule of the Byzantine Empire and fell into the dominion of the Arabs; or as the Samaritans themselves call it, "the kingdom of the Sons of Ishmael." Some centuries would elapse before Greek and Aramaic—which had been for nearly a millennium, the one the public, the

other the domestic language of the people—would yield place to the speech of the conquerors. It seems, however, ultimately to have done so completely; within little more than half a millennium all attempts at literature made by the Samaritans appear to have been in Arabic. The most important of these are the works already referred to, and used as authorities in regard to the Samaritan view of sacred history, the "Samaritan Book of Joshua" and "the Annals of Abu'l Fath." Both these books have been written in what may be called middle Arabic, neither affecting the Euphuistic elegancies of High Arabic nor falling into the vulgarity of Low. In fact these authors, as above said, use the kind of Arabic which the American translators of the Holy Scriptures have made use of. It has been noted in regard to the latter of these two writers that in some cases he shows the influence of Hebrew in his language, as when speaking of our Lord he calls Him *hameshiach* instead of either the Arabic *al-Messiḥ* or the Aramaic *Messiḥa*. The effect that Arabic has had on the Samaritans has no evidential value as to their relation to the Jews and their religion; hence for our present purpose it may be put aside.

It may be regarded as practically certain that during the period of the Greek domination, works in Greek would be composed and published by Samaritans, especially by those resident in Egypt. No fragment of any such works has been preserved. However, one never knows what the dust heaps of Egypt may yet have in store for us. This much is so far certain, that the Samaritan community in Egypt had a translation of the Law for themselves, known to the Fathers as the *Samariticon;* indeed one Jewish writer maintains that the Septuagint is merely a revisal of this, and thus would account for the numerous points of resemblance between the text behind the version of the LXX. and the Samaritan recension. Nevertheless, it would seem that the Israelite community in the province of Samaria have left no trace of the extent to which their hellenisation had gone. Consequently Greek also must be counted out.

There remain, therefore, the two Semitic tongues to be considered, Hebrew and Aramaic, represented respectively

by the Hebrew of the Torah (the Pentateuch), in the Samaritan recension, and the Samaritan Targum or Aramaic paraphrase of it. As the recension of the books of the Law possessed by the Samaritans is necessarily earlier than the Targum upon it, it will be advantageous to consider it first, and see what evidence it affords of the relation subsisting between the two divisions of the Israelite nation.

Gesenius, in his famous dissertation *de Pentateuchi Samaritani Origine Indole et Auctoritate*, devotes the seventh of the eight classes into which he divides the variants, which distinguish the Samaritan recension from that of the Jewish Massoretes, to the consideration of "forms of words accommodated to the Samaritan dialect." Assuming as he does without proof that the Jewish recension is the primary, and that therefore all variations are due to intentional alterations by the Samaritans, he under this head enumerates instances in which he believes the Samaritan scribes altered the text to suit the peculiarities of the Hebrew spoken by the inhabitants of the Northern province. This implies the possibility of investigating wherein Samaritan Hebrew differed from that of Jerusalem.

The history of these differences and their origin must be studied. When the Patriarchs came into Palestine they found Hebrew the language in possession. This is seen by the place-names as Shechem "a shoulder," Succoth "booths," Zoar "little," Kadesh "sanctuary," and many more. The language spoken by the Patriarchs themselves when they came from Mesopotamia may have been Aramaic, or Hommel may be right in holding that it was some primitive form of Arabic. However that may have been, they easily learned the tongue of the people of the land; all the more easily that between Hebrew and Aramaic the differences had not been emphasized by developments on both sides in contrasted directions. Even as late as the days of Tiglath-Pileser, as may be seen in the Sinjirli inscriptions, the differences between the two languages are much slighter than they afterwards became. When the Israelites went down into Egypt they were a large community, and one

that kept themselves separate from the Egyptians at the first; latterly, the contempt and hatred which the Egyptians had for them, enforced it; hence they did not acquire the tongue of Egypt. When they returned to Palestine, Hebrew was still the language of the people of the land, as seen by such personal names as Adonizedek.

In the North, Hebrew had been fully developed by the Phœnicians, and with them it had become alphabetic. This alphabet they had conveyed to the Greeks and Cretans. We have already adverted to the evidence which the Greek alphabet affords that the Phœnicians, in that prehistoric time in which they had passed on their alphabet to the Hellenes, had ceased to pronounce the gutturals. As it seems probable that none of the other Palestinian races laboured under this defect (else the gutturals would have disappeared from the spoken tongue of the Jews); there were already two dialects of Hebrew in Palestine, one of these was peculiar at all events to a portion of the north of Palestine. Hence there is an inherent probability in the assumption of Gesenius that the dialect spoken in Samaria differed from that in Jerusalem. One may demur to the way in which he takes for granted that the Torah was originally written in the Southern dialect, and was assimilated by intentional alterations to that of the North; the alterations may as readily have been due to the desire of the Jewish scribes to assimilate the language of the sacred Law to their Southern speech.

When, under the seventh of his classes of variants—points in which the Samaritan recension of the Pentateuch differed from that of the Massoretes—Gesenius discusses "Samaritanisms," he has to admit that these are singularly few. Had the dissertation been written a few years later, or had it been republished by the author, he would have lessened the number yet more by omitting some of those he notes. The first subsection of these variants contains those due to interchange of gutturals. Had Gesenius already published the collection of Samaritan hymns which he found in London when he wrote his dissertation, we may be sure he would have omitted this subsection, since he must have seen that while five of these eight hymns were alphabetic,

and therefore that the alphabet had a fixed order, there was not one of them but was irregular in regard to the place of the gutturals. In the first of these, there are three *ain* verses in all of which the letter is misplaced; it occupies the positions of *aleph*, *he*, and *ḥeth*, and *he* occupies the legitimate place of *ain*. There could be no intentional variation in this case, but it was necessarily a blunder due to pure inability to distinguish between the gutturals. That in the Samaritan recension "Hararat" appears instead of "Ararat," proves merely that the Samaritan scribe inserted the *he*, which he did not pronounce, instead of the *aleph*, which he equally did not pronounce; or the delinquent may have been the Jewish scribe who dropped the *he* and inserted an *aleph*. In regard to the majority of the instances in the Torah which Gesenius brings forward, they are found only in one manuscript, which Walton, or the editor of the Paris polyglot which he copied, perversely chose to put as the text. This is the case in regard to בעי for באי in Gen. xxiii. 18, שבה for שבע xxvii. 19, הפו for אפוא xxvii. 33, to take no more. Gesenius recognises a liability on the part of the Samaritans to confuse the *ahevi* letters, a liability which rather indicates accident than intention. Sometimes the Samaritan form is the more primitive, as פיי instead of פי (Gen. xlv. 12), in which case the variation has more probably come from the Jewish scribes than from those of Samaria. The elliptical sentence, Gen. xiii. 9, which may be rendered literally from the Massoretic: "Is not the whole land before thee? separate thyself now from me; if the left I will go to the right, if the right I will go to the left." To make this intelligible the English versions insert, "if thou wilt take." On the other hand, the Samaritan implies another insertion and would read, "If you prefer the left I will take the right"; in the Samaritan there is no creation of a new verb or couple of verbs for the transaction. In the following subsections, Gesenius takes up the various grammatical elements and considers the variants under them. Pronouns are among the earliest forms of speech to be distinguished. Gesenius points out the differences which subsist between the two dialects in regard to them. The first instance he brings is אתי *atti* instead of אַתְּ *att* for

the 2nd pers. fem. In all probability, Gesenius is right in regarding this as a Northern peculiarity, because the cases outside the Torah in which it occurs, are all in narratives concerning events and persons in the North; thus Jud. xvii. 1, is in regard to Micah's mother; 1 Kings xiv. 2, is in the narrative of Jeroboam's wife; the other instance is in regard to the Shunammite woman, 2 Kings viii. 1. In his grammar and his dictionary, Gesenius admits that the Samaritan is the primitive form. This renders it probable that the alteration was due to the Southern scribes. If it is the case, as some maintain, that originally there were no *matres lectionis*, then although a word was written without the י it would be pronounced with it. The plural of the 2nd pers. fem. broadens the final vowel by making the vowel not *seghol* but *tsere*, written *plenum;* probably the softer pronunciation is the earlier. In regard to the suffix of the 2nd pers. fem. the vowel is strengthened by the י *yodh;* this tendency to multiply *matres lectionis* is a sign of relative recency, as in the inscriptions these are few. The Hebrew verb distinguishes the gender in the second person; in ordinary Hebrew this pers. fem. in the pret. sing. terminates in ת *tau* with the *shva;* in Samaritan it terminates in י *yodh*, a form most likely primitive. An instance of the insertion of the י *yodh*, when the vowel is not in Southern Hebrew at all cognate with it, is to be seen in Gen. iii. 21, and constantly elsewhere when the word recurs, the Samaritan has כיתנות *kithnoth* instead of the Massoretic כָּתְנוֹת *kathnoth.* It may be remarked that there is an uncertainty as to the vowelling of the word; sometimes it was pronounced *kuthoneth*, sometimes *kᵉthonᶜth.* The word χιτών shows that the *i* sound was in the first syllable when Greeks borrowed the word. This seems to indicate that the Samaritan pronunciation is a survival of the primitive.

Gesenius brings forward a number of individual cases of what he considers examples to the point. Many of them are due to the fact that the Samaritans did not pronounce the gutturals; and a scribe, writing to the dictation of one reading from the Torah, would, if he were not specially attentive, be liable to confuse one guttural with another, utterly without intention in the matter. Some of the

examples, however, seem to imply a real difference of a kind that may be looked upon as dialectic. One example may be sufficient to show this; in Gen. xi. 6, the Massoretic has יְזִמּוּ *yaz'mu* from זָמַם *zamam;* instead of this the Samaritan has יזמנו *yazmanu* as if derived from a root זמן *zaman.*

Without considering all the examples which Gesenius has produced, it must be admitted that he has proved the correctness of his presupposition that there were distinct differences between the Hebrew of Samaria and that of Jerusalem, and further, that these are to be observed in the two recensions. The study of these reveals the fact that while some of these differences would seem to indicate that the more primitive linguistic forms have been preserved in the Samaritan, others show that in the Massoretic at times are found the earlier forms. This proves that Hebrew developed along one line in Samaria and in Jerusalem along a somewhat different one.

The differences which resulted from the dropping of the gutturals has been considered in another connection. There are, however, a series of cases which are placed by Gesenius in another category of variants. His first class is "Readings which have been corrected by the Samaritan scribes in conformity with the rules of ordinary grammar." In the Pentateuch, according to the Massoretic recension, and in the Pentateuch alone, the 3rd personal pronoun הוּא *hu'* is common in gender so far as the *k'thibh*—"what is written"—is concerned; it is vowelled for reading as if it were written הִיא *hi'* when the pronoun refers to a noun feminine. In the Samaritan, the feminine pronoun is written as it is to be read. The Massoretic reading is due to a blunder in the MS. which the Massoretes made their model, the blunders of which they have perpetuated. The origin of the blunder is not difficult to discover. In the earliest inscription in which the square character appears, that of Kefr Bir'im, there is no distinction between ו *vav* and י *yodh.* The MS. used by the Massoretes must have been written in that script, and copied by scribes who did not write to dictation but followed with the eye what was before them. The Samaritan scribes were under no such liability to mistake, as in the script of Samaria

י *yodh* is quite different from ו *vav*[1]; hence they are not so much to be regarded as having corrected the Massoretic text in this point, as having avoided the blunder of its writers. Another case of Massoretic blunder due to the same cause is וָלֶד *walad* in Gen. xi. 30, instead of יָלַד *yalad* as it appears in the Samaritan. Another difference has a slightly more complicated history. In Gen. i. 24 occurs what Gesenius in his grammar remarks as an early form of the *construct* חַיְתוֹ *haitho;* the early sign of the *construct* appears rather to have been י *yodh*, as seen in such names as Melchizedek, Gabriel, etc. But primitively as seen from the inscriptions the final *yodh* was very generally omitted; consequently the Samaritan scribe wrote the ordinary *construct*, and the scribe who wrote the Massorete mother manuscript copied the *yodh* as *vav*, and this has been perpetuated. Another set of cases is where the Massoretic has the pronominal suffix of the 3rd mas. ה *oh* instead of the ordinary ו *o*, as has the Samaritan. A case might be made out for this being an earlier form, as it is found on the Moabite Stone; it is, however, simpler to regard it as also due to blunder on the part of the Massoretic scribes. If, as is probable, one of the manuscripts in the ancestry of the Massoretic model was written in the Samaritan script, and the copyist had confused *vav* and *he*, these letters resembling each other in that script, the mistake would be easily explained. The suffix in *he* on the stele of Mesha may represent *ah* not *oh* and so be an Aramaism like the plural in *nun.*

Even if we neglect those differences which are due to scribal blunders, there still remain differences numerous enough to show that there was a distinction between the Northern and Southern Hebrew, scarcely great enough to be called a dialectic difference yet still quite distinct. There is a difference between the English written or spoken by an educated American and that spoken or written by an educated Englishman, but it is too slight to be regarded as a dialectic difference. Because an American speaks of

[1] While this is the case almost universally, in some carelessly written MSS. *yodh* is written in a way that it can only with difficulty be distinguished from *vav* or *he* (Gesenius, *Carmina Samaritana*, p. 6).

"railroad cars" and says that he "feeds corn to his horse," while an Englishman speaks of "railway carriages" and "feeds his horse with corn," these differences cannot be dignified by being spoken of as "differences of dialect"; but they prove that in both nations the English language is a living one, and able to react on circumstances. On a similar principle we may argue that Hebrew was a living language in the North as well as in the South when the two recensions diverged. But even in the time of Ezra and Nehemiah the language ordinarily spoken by the people was Aramaic, into which the Hebrew of the Law had to be translated in order that the people could understand the sense (Neh. viii. 8). If this was so in the South, much more would it be the case in the North. The colonists sent into the territory of the Ephraimite tribes by Sargon, Esarhaddon, and Asshur-bani-pal would have Aramaic as their only common language, and the remnant of the Israelities would have to learn something of it to hold intercourse with them; this process began in the North a century and a quarter before the fall of Jerusalem. If the inhabitants of Northern Palestine received the Law at the hands of Manasseh, the son-in-law of Sanballat, in the days of Ezra and Nehemiah, still more if the flight of Manasseh took place in the time of Alexander the Great, as, following Josephus, most of the higher critics maintain, their relation to the Law in Hebrew would be very much that of the Italians of the Renaissance to the Greek classics and the New Testament. If they accepted whole-heartedly this Torah as divine, they would be as earnest, when they multiplied the copies of the Law, in their endeavours after a fastidious accuracy, as were the scholars employed by Lorenzo the Magnificent in copying the classics; it would be too sacred for them to modify the wording. It is more natural to believe that the alterations were made, on the one side or the other, while Hebrew was the spoken language of both peoples. The modifications which, according to Gesenius, have been made in the Torah by the Samaritans, are of the kind one sees in a Scotch song published in London; the language of the song is brought into closer adjustment to the Southern usage. In this case, both dialects are living.

There is, however, another language which claims to be Samaritan—Samaritan Aramaic. As we have just been maintaining, in all probability by the time of Ezra and Nehemiah, and certainly by the beginning of the Greek domination, Aramaic, not Hebrew, was the tongue ordinarily spoken in Samaria. As this was the case, there would necessarily arise the same need for interpretation and explanation as there was in Jerusalem ; hence the Samaritan Targum.

The time is past in which even scholars could regard Aramaic as a dialect of Hebrew, and a dialect of a later date. Aramaic is an ancient language, and one still spoken by the Nestorians beside the upper waters of the Tigris and the Euphrates. Aramaic and Hebrew must originally have been identical. There probably were connecting dialects; for instance, the Hebrew of the Mesha inscription has many Aramaisms in it, *e.g.*, the plural in *nun*. The earliest extant Aramaic inscriptions, those of Sinjirli, are so Hebraistic that it was at first doubtful how they should be regarded, whether as Hebrew or Aramaic. They were set up, some of them, in the reign of Tiglath-Pileser. In Scripture, there are in Aramaic six chapters in Daniel, and in Ezra what is equivalent to three. If they were written at the date they claim, they are more recent than the Sinjirli inscriptions by approximately two centuries. Slightly later than the chapters in Ezra are the Assouan papyri. In the main, the Aramaic of these documents is identical with that of Daniel. Later still is the Targum of Onkelos.[1] Although the Targums were begun in Ezra's time, they were not committed to writing till probably near the end of the second century A.D. The traditional interpretation was handed on from *meturgeman* to *meturgeman ;* and thus, although it would sustain modifications, these would be relatively slight, and there would always be an archaic flavour in the style.

[1] Some scholars maintain that the Aramaic of Onkelos is the same as that of Daniel and Ezra. It is difficult to imagine how, if they have really read both Onkelos and the Aramaic of Daniel, they can hold such an opinion. One may be permitted to think that the necessities of a theory to which they are committed have overborne their judgment. The difference is greater than that between the English of Shakespeare and that of Macaulay.

Extempore prayers among ourselves usually prefer the idioms of the Prayer Book or the Bible to that of the English of everyday speech. Notwithstanding that the Aramaic of Onkelos is archaic, the difference between it and the Aramaic of Daniel and Ezra is very marked. The Aramaic of the Bible is much more akin to that of the Assouan papyri.

At the same time, the Aramaic of the Bible may be regarded as one in dialect with that of the earlier Targums; thus, Chaucer and Cowper use the same English; the differences between them are due to time; whereas the difference between Burns and Cowper, who were contemporaries, is one of dialect. There are two leading dialects of Aramaic, Eastern and Western, otherwise called Syriac and Chaldee. If the date of the Peshitta on the one hand, and of the Targums on the other, be taken as the point of comparison, the difference most clearly marked is that in regard to the preformative of the 3rd sing. and plural mas. imperfect (future); while in Chaldee it is, as in Hebrew, י *yodh*, in Syriac the preformative in these cases is in ܢ *nun;* in the Mandæan subdialect ל *lamed* is the preformative in the substantive verb.[1] From this it is evident that the Aramaic spoken in Samaria was Western, as it had the *yodh* preformative. It has no trace, as has the Aramaic of Daniel and Ezra, of having ever been Eastern, or having had the Syriacisms rubbed off in course of successive transcriptions. Not only does the Aramaic of the Samaritan Targum differ from Biblical Aramaic but it differs also from that of the Jewish Targums.

Although not representing so truly and scientifically the

[1] The "lamed" preformative to the substantive verb is found in Daniel and Ezra. Driver regards it as a phonetic variation on *nun*. Dr Bevan would explain it by the Jewish avoidance of a combination of letters that would suggest the Divine Name, hence they write טו for 15 instead of יה as this is a Divine Name. There are, however, hundreds of instances of the substantive verb in the Targums in the 3rd mas. sing. and plural imperfect; and in no one instance does the ל preformative appear. Dr Bevan's theory proves too much, and therefore proves nothing. In Daniel, there are cases in which, judging by the rendering, the text behind the LXX. of Daniel must have had the *nun* preformative, *e.g.*, ii. 5-7.

philological connections of a language, its vocabulary exhibits the commercial and social relations of those that speak it. Moreover, it is that with which the student first becomes acquainted. The great amount of intercourse between Britain and France may be proved by the fact, that though English is a Teutonic tongue, the majority of the words which make up its vocabulary are of French origin. And the comparatively limited intercourse with Germany during the formative period of the language is shown by the paucity of those that owe their origin to words borrowed from German fully developed. Perhaps even more cognate examples are Turkish and Modern Persian; though the one is an agglutinative tongue and the other Aryan, yet so large is the infusion of Arabic in both languages that an Arabic scholar can occasionally divine the purport of sentences in these languages by Arabic alone. In the case of both of these languages, it is the fact that both peoples had adopted a religion which had originated in Arabia, and its Sacred Book, the Qorân, was written in Arabic. If the Samaritans received their religion from Judea, their language would exhibit traces of this.

The vocabulary of the Samaritan Targum differs very much from that of Onkelos. Not a few of the words, indeed, seem strange to Aramaic. It may be that some of these may be due to the blunders of ignorant scribes, writing in a time when Aramaic had ceased to be spoken, miscopying what was before them. The second word in the Targum טַלְמֵם *ṭalmes* is one that has no Semitic root; it is used to translate בָּרָא *bara*, "to create." It may, indeed, be connected with צֶלֶם *tselem*, "an image," though this does not seem a natural etymology; it cannot, at any rate, be the result of blunder, as more than once again the word occurs. The first word קְמָאוּתָה *qemautha* is supposed by some to be derived from the more ordinary קֶדֶם *qedem*, the omitted ד *daleth* being compensated for by doubling the מ *mem*; the objection to that etymology is that *d* and *m* are sounds that do not naturally coalesce. It perhaps may be connected with קוּם *qum*. Then there are words used in Samaritan Aramaic in other than the sense in which they appear in other forms of Aramaic, and especially in the Jewish Targums; thus צעק

tza'aq means to "cry out" to "shriek" in Jonathan ben Uzziel, but in the Targum of Samaria it means to "name," *e.g.*, Gen. i. 5. "God *called* the light day." The word used both in Onkelos and the Peshitta is קְרָא *q'ra.* These things show that Samaritan Aramaic developed along lines totally independent of the evolution of the Jewish and Edessene.

More important as to the philological affinities of a language than the vocabulary are its grammatical forms; and of these, the pronouns require very much to be studied. As in most Semitic tongues, pronouns have two forms, separable and inseparable, the latter being the oblique cases of the former. If the list of the forms of the 1st pers. pronoun sing. is taken from Petermann and Nicholls, of the four forms two coincide with the Hebrew, אנכי *anoki* אני *ani*, one with the Targum of Onkelos אנא *ana* (this latter is noted by both grammarians as rare), and one peculiar to the Samaritan אֲנֵה *aneh;* what is the commoner form of the 1st pers. pronoun sing., either in Targumic, Chaldee, or in Syriac, is rare in Samaritan. In the plural of the first person, so far as spelling goes, the Hebrew is followed almost to the exclusion of the Targumic, but the pronunciation does not differ so much, אנחנו *anachnu* (pron. *anaanu*), אנחנן *anachnan* (*anaanan*), אנן *anan.* The tendency is thus in the Samaritan to a greater affinity to the Hebrew than is shown in the Targumic. In regard to the 2nd pers. sing. the same tendency is seen in the dropping of the *nun.* The plural mas. is in better agreement with the Aramaic of the Targums. The 3rd pers. sing. mas. and fem. is nearly the same in Hebrew and Aramaic, only that frequently in the latter the final unpronounced *aleph* is also unwritten. The relation between the two may be seen in the paradigm on following page.

A study of these forms shows that the Aramaic of Samaria and that of Judea developed along independent lines. It confirms the statement above that, on the whole, the Samaritan has a greater affinity for the Hebrew than has the Targumic.

It has already been mentioned that the Semitic pronoun had no oblique cases, but that these were expressed by inseparable pronouns in the form of pronominal suffixes.

	SAMARITAN.		HEBREW.		CHALDEE.	
Sing.						
1st pers.	אָנֹכִי, אָנִי	ani, anaki.	אָנֹכִי	anoki.	אֲנָא	ana.
	אֲנֵה, אֲנָא	aneh, ana.	אֲנִי	ani.	אֲנָה	anah.
2nd pers. mas.	אַתָּה אַתּ	att, attah.	אַתָּה	attah.	אַנְתְּ, אַנְתָּא	anta, ant.
					אַתְּ	att.
fem.	אַתִּי	atti.	אַתְּ	att.	אַנְתְּ, אַנְתִּי	anti, ant.
					אַתְּ	att.
3rd pers. mas.	הוּ, הוּא	u', u.	הוּא	hu'.	הוּ, אִיהוּא	'ihu, hu.
fem.	הִי, הִיא	i', i.	הִיא	hi'.	הִי, אִהִיא	'ihi, hi.
Plur.						
1st pers.	אֲנַחְנוּ	anaanu.	אֲנַחְנוּ	anachnu.	אֲנַחְנָא	anachna.
	אֲנַחְנָן, אָנָן	anan, anaanan.				
2nd pers. mas.	אַתֻּם, אַתּוּן	attun, attem.	אַתֶּם	attem.	אַנְתּוּן	antun.
fem.	אַתֶּן	atten.	אַתֶּנָה	attenah.	אַנְתִּין	antin.
			אַתֶּן	atten.		
3rd pers. mas.	הֵם, הֵנּוּן	ennun, emma.	הֵם, הֶמָּה	hemma, hem.	הִמּוֹ, הִמּוּן	himmun, himmo.
fem.	הֵנִין, אֵנִין	ennên.	הֵן, הֵנָּה	hênnah, hên.	הִנֵּין	hinnên.

Fundamentally, there are two relations which require to be expressed by oblique cases—the possessive and the objective —in classic nomenclature, the genitive and accusative; the Semitic grammarians, approaching the question from a different point of view, call them nominal and verbal suffixes, the former representing the pronoun in the adjectival or possessive form, the latter, the accusative or objective form. In this somewhat complicated system it will be seen by the student that the Samaritan occupies generally an intermediate position between Hebrew and Chaldee. In regard to verbal or objective suffixes, the 1st pers. sing. is the same in all three; in the 2nd, the Chaldee is slightly liker the Hebrew; but in the 3rd, the Samaritan and the Hebrew are alike, while the Chaldee differs. The same may be said of the plural suffixes; the Hebrew and Samaritan are alike, and the Chaldee differs from both. The singular suffixes to nouns singular show, on the whole, a closer resemblance of the Samaritan to the Chaldee than to the Hebrew, but the plural suffixes to nouns singular in the Samaritan are practically identical with those in Hebrew, whereas the Chaldee differs considerably. The same judgment must be come to in regard to the pronominal suffixes to nouns plural; the Samaritan forms are practically identical with the Hebrew, but differ from the Chaldee.

Another series of words in which linguistic affinities may be sought is the numerals. A study of the table of numerals shows that while the Samaritan conforms in the units to the Chaldee, generally speaking, and differs from the Hebrew, in regard to the decades (twenty, thirty, forty, etc.) the affinity of the Samaritan is closer to the Hebrew. In both Hebrew and Chaldee the decades are expressed by changing the unit into the plural, as ארבע *arba'*, "four," in both languages, so "forty" becomes in Hebrew ארבעים *arba'im*, and in Chaldee it becomes ארבעין *arbe'in;* the Samaritan here agrees with the Hebrew and has אַרְבָּעִים *arba'im.* As the unit "three" in Samaritan is the same as in Chaldee, of course the first part of the term for "thirty" is the Chaldee term, but the termination agrees with the Hebrew. In regard to a "hundred" the Samaritan is unlike either Hebrew or Chaldee, which agree with each

other. A "thousand" is the same in all Semitic languages. It is thus seen that in regard to numerals, as in regard to pronouns, the Samaritan is much closer to the Hebrew than is the Chaldee of the Targums. Occasionally double forms appear; in such cases, not infrequently, the one is the Hebrew form and the other the Chaldee.

The study of the verbal paradigms reveals parallel phenomena in the case of verbal forms. The singular Preterite of the Samaritan is identical with that of the Hebrew verb, but differs from the Chaldee in several particulars. The vocalisation is different; while in Samaritan, as in Hebrew, the first syllable is open with *qametz*, in the Chaldee the first syllable has the *sh'va vocale.* The plural is nearly in as close agreement with the Hebrew; the Hebrew, however, has no feminine of the 3rd plural which the Samaritan agrees with the Chaldee in having. The 1st pers. plu. ends in *na* in Samaritan and Chaldee, while the Hebrew ends in *nu;* but in regard to the first syllable, there is agreement all through between the Samaritan and the Hebrew. In the Future or Imperfect, the singular persons are consonantally closely alike in all three, except that the Chaldee retains the final *nun* in the 2nd fem. All three differ as to the vocalisation of the second syllable. The 2nd and 3rd pers. mas. of the Samaritan agrees consonantally with the Hebrew, but in the 2nd and 3rd plural fem. it agrees with the Chaldee. In the Infinitive there are in Samaritan two forms, the one agreeing with the Hebrew, the other with the Chaldee. Consonantally, Samaritan, Hebrew, and Chaldee agree in the Imperative, save in the plural fem., in which the Chaldee differs from the other two by ending in *aleph* instead of *he.* In regard to the participles all three are different. As Samaritan is clearly a form of Aramaic, the arrangement of the conjugations follows the Chaldee; the passive conjugations are distinguished by the syllable אִתְ *ith* prefixed to the root. While this is the rule, instances occur of Niphal, as Gen. x. 25, *niphlagat;* so also, instead of *ithpael* in some codices the pual form appears, as Exod. xxix. 33, *yisulla.* Before a scribe would drop into such a form it must have been used by the Aramaic speaking people about him. There is even a case

in which the Hophal conjugation is used instead of the more legitimate Ittaphal, Lev. x. 13, *ufqedet.* In Biblical Aramaic there are instances of the Hophal, as Dan. vii. 11, *hubad.* Another verbal peculiarity in regard to *ain-vav* and *ain-yodh* verbs is that the letter *ain* is introduced in the preterite קעם *qam*, Gen. iv. 8, דער *dar*, Num. xxxii. 40.

Primitive relationships also afford evidence of linguistic affinities; father—mother, son—daughter, brother—sister, husband—wife. The first of these pairs is the same in all Semitic languages. In regard to the second pair, while *bar* is the common Aramaic word for a "son," *ben* occasionally appears in Samaritan. The Samaritans manifest their independence in that they have evolved a regular plural for *bar;* instead of the usual *benin* they have frequently *barim.* The Samaritan word for "brother" is not *aḥ*, the word so generally used in Semitic languages, but *telim.* As to "husband" and "wife" the second is represented by the same word as in the Aramaic of the Targums. In regard to "husband," the Samaritan generally prefers *geber* to *ba'al*, while the Targum of Onkelos prefers the latter to the former.

The particles of a language are the words which most distinctly mark its relationships. The common adverbs, prepositions, and conjunctions remain with a minimum of change in the historical development of a language. Hence it is that in these may be found the clearest evidence of external interference: thus, when in English we find that so common a word as "very" is a Latin interloper which has displaced the Teutonic *sehr*, we may deduce this to be the result of external interference by a people speaking a tongue derived from Latin. When the lists of Samaritan adverbs to be found in Nicholls' *Samaritan Grammar* is compared with those in the Targums, it is found that only a minority of them are common to both subdialects of Aramaic. The majority of the Samaritan adverbs are not found in the Targums, and several Targumic adverbs are not found in the Samaritan. There are instances of Hebrew adverbs being found in the Samaritan which do not occur in Targumic, *e.g.*, לו *lu*, "would that." Certainly the great majority of prep-

ositions and conjunctions are common to both forms of Western Aramaic; yet even in these classes of particles there are cases in which the Samaritan has prepositions which the Targumic does not employ, as כְּבֹן *kebun*, "over against," כַּתִּי *katti*, "below," סְעַד *se'ad*, "as far as." There are some which the Samaritan has in common with Hebrew, as אֲצֶל *etzel*, "near." The same is the case with conjunctions; there are several Samaritan conjunctions that are not found in Onkelos; as for instance בָּרַן *baran*, "lest," מַטִי *maṭi*, "because." There are some conjunctions which Samaritan has in common with Hebrew which yet are not found in Onkelos, *e.g.*, אִם *im*, "if." Certainly, the inseparable prepositions are the same in Samaritan as in Chaldee, but this is not very significant, as they are common to all Semitic languages. The enclitic conjunction וּ *u* or וְ *ve* is also common to Hebrew and Arabic as well as to Aramaic.

There are cases in which Hebraisms occur in all the Aramaic versions of the Scripture. The most noticeable of these is יַת *yat* or *yath*, the sign of the accusative. It had almost disappeared from Aramaic by historic times; it occurs only once in Daniel as the support of an oblique case of a pronoun (Dan. iii. 12). It is to be noted that the equivalent וַת *vath* occurs only once in the Sinjirli inscriptions, and in a similar grammatical connection, as the support of a pronominal oblique case; וָתֹה *vatho* (Hadad i. 28). This represents the Hebrew אֵת *eth*, and occurs in the Targums, and in the Peshitta also, where *eth* is found in the original. There are, however, other phenomena in the Samaritan Targum which exhibit the special relation in which it stands to the Hebrew original. Samaritan has, as has every other form of Aramaic, the *status emphaticus*, which serves for the definite article, but in addition it on occasion uses the Hebrew article in הַ־ *ha:* thus in Gen. i. 27, "man" as the species is written הָאדָם *ha'adam*. More striking than this, as evidence of the influence of Hebrew on Samaritan, is the occasional occurrence of the *vav* conversive, *e.g.*, Gen. i. 3, וַיְהִי נָהַר *vayehe nahar*, "and light was," and Exod. x. 8, וַיְעַזַר *vaya'zar*, "was brought in."

The first example is in Petermann's text but not in Brull's, the latter in Brull's but not in Petermann's; but when copyists show a tendency to fall into such Hebraisms, it is evidence that these were not uncommon in the speech of the people.

But the Targum is not the only specimen of Samaritan Aramaic which has been preserved. There are collections of hymns which will fall to be considered under the head of the Literature of the Samaritans. Apart, however, from the consideration of them as literature, attention may be directed to the form the language assumes when it occurs not in a translation from Hebrew but in independent original compositions. In them there is manifested, even more strongly than in the Targum, the tendency to mingle the two languages; when a hymnist intends to write Hebrew he drops unconsciously into Aramaic, and *vice versâ*. The second hymn in Heidenheim's collection is on the whole Hebrew, yet the first word יִתְרַבִּי *yithrabbi*, "be magnified," is Aramaic; the verb is common to Hebrew and Aramaic, but the conjugation is Aramaic, and the word terminates as the Aramaic form does. The next three words are Hebrew זֶה הַשֵּׁם הַקָּדֹשׁ *ze hash-shem haq-qodesh*, "this is the holy name," although the order is scarcely that of classic Hebrew; and it is to be noted that instead of the Aramaic *status emphaticus* the Hebrew article is employed. The clause that follows ends in the word נכבד (*kabhed* in the *niphal*), a Hebrew grammatical form which, as already mentioned, sometimes occurs in Samaritan; but further, although the root is an Aramaic one, in the form of *k'bhad* it means, not as it does here, "to be honoured" but "to be angry." No. IV. of the same collection begins in Hebrew, but before the sentence ends, drops into Aramaic; the last word, although common to both Hebrew and Aramaic, is in an Aramaic conjugation. In short, many of these hymns have the aspect of an uneducated Scotsman's English or an Englishman's Scotch; in both cases there is, as here, a perpetual liability to leave the dialect intended and begun, and drop into the other with which the writer or speaker is better acquainted.

The phenomena which have just been noted—the Hebraistic features in the Samaritan grammar, the introduction of Hebrew words and constructions into Aramaic compositions, and the liability to pass from one language to the other—are worthy of special consideration. All the more is this the case, when, along with them the state of matters in Judea is brought under review. The people of the Southern Kingdom were ignorant of Aramaic at the time of Sennacherib's invasion, for Eliakim and Shebna requested Rabshakeh to speak to them in Aramaic in order that their conference might not be understood "by the people that were upon the wall." A similar condition of ignorance in regard to the language of diplomacy may be supposed to have prevailed among the inhabitants of Northern Palestine at the same date, as the few colonists sent by Sargon would not be numerous enough to affect the language of the people generally. While this was the case as long as the kingdom of Judah still stood, when both North and South fell under the Persian rule, the circumstances, linguistically, of the two divisions of the land must have been very similar. In both, the original language of the population had been Hebrew, and still to a certain extent was so. In both there had been intruded an element whose language was Aramaic. The few colonists sent by Sargon had their numbers augmented by the much larger number sent by Esarhaddon. and later still by others sent by his son and successor Asshur-bani-pal. Not impossibly, these would be supplemented by natives of Syria and of other countries whose language was Aramaic. There is no record of Nebuchadnezzar sending colonists into Judea, after the Assyrian manner; but members of neighbouring Aramaic speaking nations drifted in and seized lands and heritages the lawful proprietors of which had been slain, were captives, or had gone down to Egypt. The probability is that in both districts the language spoken was Aramaic, with a large admixture of Hebrew. There is no probability that the colonists sent into the territories of the Northern tribes pronounced Aramaic without the gutturals as the Samaritans did Hebrew. Although the Assyrians had in their own

cuneiform language only one guttural, ח *ḥeth*, yet from the evidence of the Sinjirli inscriptions in which there is no uncertainty as to א *aleph* and ע *ain*, or as to ה *he* and ח *ḥeth*, we may be reasonably sure that they made use of all the gutturals in speaking Aramaic. But the habit of the conquered people overbore the custom of the colonists sent by the Imperial power. Taking somewhat of the position of the Assyrian colonists in the North, in the South were those who returned from the Babylonian captivity. They would be accustomed to speak Aramaic in public, and in intercourse with their neighbours in Babylonia, but almost certainly among themselves they spoke Hebrew in comparative purity. There is this peculiarity to be noted, these returned captives would necessarily speak Syriac, that is to say Eastern Aramaic, not Western or Chaldee. But the Targums of Onkelos and of Jonathan ben Uzziel are in Chaldee. Intercourse with the people of the land who naturally spoke Chaldee would gradually rub off the orientalisms of the new-comers and assimilate their dialect to that of those around them.

The resemblance between the two communities was so great, at once in external circumstances and linguistically, that an assimilation of language might have been supposed to have resulted, all the more because they were near neighbours and professed to worship the same God, and, before the arrival of Ezra, had been united together through frequent intermarriages. If they received the Law by the hands of Manasseh, it would seem to have been natural that they would at the same time have adopted the Southern pronunciation of the Hebrew, and the Southern Targum.

In both the South and the North Hebrew must still have been understood, as is evidenced by the fact that in the reign of Darius, the prophets Haggai and Zechariah, and later still Malachi, delivered their message in Hebrew with something like purity. If the Samaritans received all the Ezrahitic additions to the Law with unquestioning docility, how was it that they did not assimilate their mode of pronouncing the sacred language to that of those whose teaching they had accepted? It may have been that Hebrew was used only in regard to sacred things, much as Latin in the Middle Ages.

This probably continued down through the Persian period until the domination of the Greeks set in. The language became debased, as may be seen in Ecclesiastes. If the original Hebrew of Ecclesiasticus may be judged by the manuscript so opportunely discovered, it is written in a much nearer approach to classic Hebrew than is the language of Ecclesiastes. Probably the style of Ben Sira represents an endeavour to restore Hebrew to its pristine purity, a movement akin to the Atticistic style of the Greek writers of the age of the Antonines. It is singular that though Hebrew was known so late, it has influenced the language of the Targums so little. It might have been expected that, as the Targums were handed on, not by writing but traditionally, from one *meturgeman* to another, the influence of Hebrew would have been all the more observable; but the traces are few, compared with what are to be found in the Targum of the Samaritans.

Another phenomenon is worthy of note. Although it was late in the second century when the Targum of Onkelos was committed to writing, and the Roman rule was, so far as language was concerned, a continuation of the Greek, there are practically no evidences of Hellenic influence in its vocabulary. In this, the Targum of Onkelos differs from the Peshitta of the New Testament; in it, such connectives as אלא *alla*, "but," and גר *gar*, "for," indicate the influence of Greek. The Samaritan Targum shows less trace, but it has some, as for instance, גנוס *genos*, which is the Greek γένος (Gen. i. 12). The preposition כתי *katti*, "below," is derived from κατά. Yet certainly, considering the length of the Greek predominance, it is singular that it has left so little trace. The Hellenic influence was dominant for close upon a millennium; yet the Arabic domination, which has lasted for three centuries more, has produced even less effect on the Aramaic of Samaria.

All this emphasizes the independent position of the Samaritans in relation to the Jews. It has been noted how much more prominent the Hebrew element is in Samaritan Aramaic than in the Aramaic of Judea, which expressed itself in the Targum of Onkelos. This difference may have been

due to the fact that the colonists who brought Aramaic with them came to Samaria in successive relays, with considerable intervals of time between each. Each several detachment would be swallowed up of the people among whom they had been sent to dwell. When a new band of colonists arrived, they would find those who had preceded them absorbed among the Israelites, speaking a sort of Hebrew and worshipping JHWH with somewhat uncertain rites. In such circumstances, the original colonists may not infrequently have become more vehement partisans of the native cause than the natives themselves. The descendants of the English colonists in Ireland became *Hibernis Hiberniores* — more partisanly Irish than the Irish themselves. One result of this is that the Aramaic in use in Northern Palestine became very much Hebraized. Judging by their hymns, the language of the Samaritans became somewhat of an amalgam.

The Samaritans maintained this linguistic separation from their brethren of Judea, despite that, under the Empire of Rome, Judea and Samaria were usually under one governor. Herod had Samaria added to his dominions, and united—Archelaus inherited them. When the Romans sent Coponius first, and others till Porcius Festus, as procurators, the two provinces were united under their rule. Notwithstanding that they had the same religion, were under the same civil authority, they maintained not merely independence of the Jews but even an enmity to them, so that the Samaritan woman said to our Lord, "The Jews have no dealings with the Samaritans." Josephus in his history exhibits the attitude of the Jew to the Samaritans: he has no good word to say of them. This hatred they repaid with interest. That being so, their testimony to the contents of the Mosaic Law must be regarded as that of independent witnesses, not the mere parrot-rote repetition of pupils who imitate their master.

Literature of the Samaritans.

The consideration of the language of the Samaritans leads naturally to a survey of their literature. All the later Samaritan literature, that is to say, all after the twelfth

century of our era, has been written in Arabic. Even the so-called Samaritan "Book of Joshua," to which reference has been made in a previous chapter, is written in the tongue of "the Sons of Ishmael." The historian who is the principal source of our knowledge of the views entertained by the Samaritans as to sacred history, Abu'l Fatḥ, wrote his Annals in the same language. All this, though written by Samaritans, is to be reckoned not as Samaritan but as Arabic literature. Similarly, during the rule of the Greeks, and under the dominance of Rome and its continuation by the Cæsars of Byzantium, there were Samaritan books composed in Greek the names of which may have come down to us. Even if these works were discovered in Egypt among heaps of papyri and ostraka, they would be regarded not as specimens of Samaritan literature but as that of later hellenism. It is therefore entirely to such literary remains as are still to be found in Samaritan Hebrew or Aramaic that our attention will be directed.

The amount of this is exceedingly scanty. Some time in the second century of the Christian era there must have been a wholesale destruction of Samaritan writings. In the Samaritan "Book of Joshua," above referred to, this disaster is attributed to the reign of Hadrian; Abu'l Fatḥ, however, describes this destruction as taking place more than half a century later, in the reign of Commodus, the son and successor of Marcus Aurelius. The study of the Samaritan Chronicles reveals in them such an amount of chronological confusion that little reliance can be laid on particulars. When it is noted that in them Adrinus (Hadrian) is declared to be the successor of Alexander the Great, and he of Buchtinosor (Nebuchadnezzar), it becomes evident how little trust is to be placed on the chronology of Samaritan tradition. All that is clear is, that somewhere in the second century A.D., the Samaritans had to endure a severe persecution, and that in that persecution the destruction of the sacred books was a special object of their persecutors. As the agents of the Imperial police would be unable to read the Samaritan character, all books in Samaritan would be seized and destroyed, as well as the copies of the Torah of which they were more immediately in search. The result was (so the

Samaritans say) that the Torah alone was saved, and, according to some authorities, with it the list of the successive high priests; this, however, is doubtful.

Although the destruction has not been so absolute as this would indicate, very little has survived. The most important of these literary survivals is the Samaritan Targum.[1] As it is a translation, it has a larger infusion of Hebrew than it otherwise might have had. As a translation, it is more faithful than even Onkelos. To show the difference, let the curse on the serpent (Gen. iii. 14, 15), as it appears in the Samaritan Targum, be compared with the version in Onkelos. In the Samaritan it is: "And the Lord God said to the serpent, because thou hast done this, thou art cursed above all cattle and every beast of the field. . . . And I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed; and he shall bruise thy head and thou shalt bruise his heel." On the other hand, Onkelos renders: "I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy son and her son. He will remember thee and what thou didst to him at the beginning, and thou wilt be watchful of him at the end." Another passage which involves some difficulty is Gen. iv. 7. The Samaritan rendering is: "If thou doest well, thou shalt be absolved; if thou doest not well, at the door sin croucheth; at thy hand is its remedy, and thou shalt rule over it;" but Onkelos is much more paraphrastic: "If thou doest thy work well, thou shalt be pardoned; if thou dost not do thy work well, to the day of judgment thy sin shall be reserved, when vengeance shall be exacted from thee, if thou do not repent; but if thou repent, it shall be remitted to thee." An example in which Onkelos is, though paraphrastic, not so much so, is verse 23 of the same chapter—the song of Lamech. It may be compared with the straightforward rendering of

[1] Dr Paul Kahle (*Textkritische u. Lexikal. Bemerk. zum Sam. Pentateuch Targum*) thinks that there never was, among the Samaritans, a generally recognised Targum like that of Onkelos among the Jews. He is led to that conclusion by the number and nature of the various readings found in such fragments of Samaritan Targum as have turned up from time to time. His conclusion, though important, has no direct bearing on our inquiry as to the Samaritan language and doctrine.

the Samaritan. Other instances for comparison might be suggested, *e.g.*, the Blessing of Jacob, especially the sections in regard to Judah and Joseph (Gen. xlix. 8-12, 22-26). On the whole, the Samaritan Targum is written in a simple direct style.

There are several collections of hymns extant; some of them appear to be early, dating from pre-Christian times. There was a collection of these hymns made by a certain Mattura, whose date is difficult to fix. Heidenheim has published a collection of hymns which he thinks is really that of Mattura. These hymns are all liturgic, without much poetic or religious feeling. They are of various dates, as has just been intimated—some earlier, some later. The earliest are written in fairly good Hebrew, with an occasional admixture of forms drawn from Samaritan Aramaic; they are largely centos of phrases from the Pentateuch, and are mostly fragmentary. They are all anonymous, save that the names of Moses and Joshua are placed as titles. There were, in all probability, collections of hymns earlier than any still extant; these, however, have been lost in the persecution referred to. The hymns in the collection published by Heidenheim in the *Bibliotheca Samaritana*, which are in Hebrew, probably are survivals from those earlier groups. Heidenheim divides the hymns of the collection which he has published into three classes. (1) The first, those in relatively pure Hebrew, he would ascribe to the period beginning with the time when the Jews rejected the help of the Samaritans, which these had offered when the former had returned from captivity and were engaged in rebuilding the temple at Jerusalem. The erection of the temple on Mount Gerizim, in consequence of this, led naturally to the composition of hymns, suitable to the ritual which they had set up. (2) The second class were composed during the period in which the Samaritans separated themselves doctrinally from Sadduceanism. This revolution in the Samaritan outlook was apparently due to a considerable extent to the influence of Christianity. The language in which these hymns are written is New Hebrew, with a yet greater admixture of Aramaic forms. (3) The third class is formed from hymns during the period beginning with the eighth

Christian century, in which Arabic was beginning to replace Aramaic and Greek as the predominant language, alike of the home and the market-place. The hymns show some slight traces of Arabic influence in their language.

This collection, which Heidenheim has published, is preceded by a lengthened introduction in Hebrew. It is really a cento of verses extracted from Genesis, and relates the history of the Patriarchs from the call of Abraham to the carrying down of Joseph into Egypt. It ends with the statement: "And JHWH was with Joseph and he found (favour in the eyes of his master) and JHWH blessed the house of the Egyptian, and he left[1] all that he had in the hand of Joseph; and Joseph was a goodly person and well favoured." This termination suggests that the true end of the "Introduction" has been lost. While the call of Abraham forms a natural beginning to such a sketch, the slavery of Joseph does not form an equally natural conclusion. The sketch is interesting, as it presents some variations from the narrative in the received text, Massoretic or Samaritan. As an instance, alike in the Massoretic and the Samaritan, Abraham is said (Gen. xii. 6) to have "passed through the land to the place Shechem, to the plain (or 'oak') of Moreh"; in this introduction it is to the "height" of Moreh that he comes; this merely involves the change of א *aleph* into ע *ain*, a change all the more easy to make as, by the Samaritans, neither letter was pronounced.

As an example of these hymns, that numbered II. in this collection may be taken. It is called "The Prayer of Moses," and is in fairly good Hebrew. Its language has already been referred to. A translation is subjoined to give a specimen of Samaritan hymnology:—

Magnify this holy name; one is JHWH and to be glorified;
There is none beside Him in the Heaven above or upon the earth beneath;
There is none beside Him.
Blessed be JHWH our God, whose name is glorious and rightly to be praised.

---

[1] The text reads, by blunder, ויעבד "and he served."

May our heart be circumcised, and the heart of our seed ;
Let us fear Him and love Him ;
Let us learn and observe the ten words of the Covenant
Which He spake in Horeb from the midst of the fire,
In the day of the assembly.

JHWH God merciful and gracious, forgiving to us and to our fathers,
Our rebellion, in Thy grace, everything in which we have sinned,
Transgressed, gone astray before Thee.
Ah Lord, I AM THAT I AM, remember Thy servants,
Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, O Lord, in their labour.
Turn not away from us on account of our hardness, our wickedness, and our sins ;
We are sinners before Thy Majesty, and transgressors before Thy Greatness.
Thou art JHWH a God merciful and gracious ;
Go now with us, O Lord, in our midst,
For a hard stiff-necked people are we.
And forgive us our iniquities and our sins ;
And give to us our inheritance, O Lord, the merciful.
For Thy great name, deliver us from everything false.
And save us from every abomination, and cleanse our souls from every abomination,
And sanctify our bodies from all uncleanness.
And forgive to us and to our fathers our rebellion, in Thy mercy,
From everything in which we have sinned, erred, and transgressed before Thee.
O Lord, we will circumcise our hearts,
And shall return to Thee with our whole heart and soul ;
And we shall love Thee with all our heart, with all our soul, and with all our might.
For good to ourselves we will beseech Thy favour, and Thy goodness, Thy compassions, and Thy favours.
Consecrate us to observe Thy ceremonies, and Thy statutes, and Thy commandments, and Thy judgments at all times.

That will give some idea of the character of those hymns. It may be noted that some of these poems referred to above —as for instance, No. IV.—begin with a quotation from the Pentateuch in Hebrew (Deut. xxxiii. 4), then immediately lapse into Aramaic. Others, while wholly Aramaic, yet admit numerous Hebraistic forms ; others, intended to be Hebrew, admit Aramaic forms and constructions. At times, as above noted, the Arabisms may be observed. In regard to verse forms, there seems to be no case of the parallelism which we

find in Hebrew poetry, maintained through a poem. In three, IX., X., XI., there is use of a refrain, as in Ps. cxxxvi. A very considerable number are in rhyme; not rhyming couplets, but using one rhyme through a stanza of a dozen lines or more. Thus No. XII., a short poem of twelve verses and twenty-four lines, has only one rhyme, the syllable נו *nu*. All scholars are aware that a similar frequency of pronominal suffixes occurs in Hebrew; and that many passages in the Prophets have so great an appearance of rhyming, that some have been led to regard this as not merely, like alliteration in English poetry, an adornment, but of the constitutive essence of the versification. Study soon reveals that the Hebrew prophets did not build up their poems by the help of similarly ending lines. It is different with the Samaritans; they show that rhyme is with them no casual occurrence, by placing the rhyming syllables one over the other in a column, with a blank space of varying length between it and the rest of the word of which it is the termination. Some of these poems combine with rhyme the acrostic character so frequent in the Hebrew Psalms.[1] An example of this is to be found in XXI., which has twenty-two stanzas of varying lengths, each of which begins with the letter which follows in alphabetic order that with which its predecessor began. Like not a few of the Samaritan alphabetic poems, it begins with ע *ain* instead of א *aleph*, an irregularity due to the Samaritan inability to pronounce the gutturals. It is a hymn for the Great Day of Atonement, and is attributed to the seven daughters of Jethro, the father-in-law of Moses. Each stanza of this long poem of 665 lines has only one rhyme; the rhyming syllable in the first stanza is *al*, in the second is *yah*, and so on: it is to be noted that the fifth stanza, the rhyming syllable of which is רע *ra'*, carries on the assonance with רה, רח and רא. It recounts the history of the Pentateuch in liturgic form. Several other of these hymns are, like this, at once alphabetic and

[1] In mediæval times the Jews sometimes produced poems of this construction, *e.g.* the hymn *Agdamuth*, written by Meyer ben Izhaq in the eleventh century; the first forty-four of its ninety-nine lines are both rhyming and alphabetic. It rhymes throughout on the syllable תָּא.

rhyming. Although there is no parallelism, the lines in many of the poems are divided by a pause into two approximately equal parts; in this way there is a rhythmic effect produced.

Earlier by sixty years than Heidenheim's publication were the *Carmina Samaritana* given to the world by Gesenius. He found a collection of Samaritan hymns in the British Museum, but through misplacing of the leaves the whole had the aspect of confused fragments. As some of them were accompanied by an Arabic translation and some were not, and several were alphabetic, he was enabled to discover that there were twelve separate hymns. There were in the University of Gotha where he was professor, certain Samaritan MSS. which he collated. Eight of the twelve hymns, the first seven and the twelfth, he has published with a Latin version; a summary is given of the remaining four. Six of those he has given are alphabetic; but unlike the alphabetic hymns published by Heidenheim, the alphabetic succession is not restricted merely to the first letter of each stanza; but if the stanza has four lines, it is every second line; if two, each line. Gesenius would date those hymns, which he has published, as composed possibly after the persecution inflicted on the Samaritans by Justinian, or that endured in the beginning of the Mohammedan rule. The probability is that they belong to various epochs, as they do not all indicate recency of persecution. The prevalence of rhyme in some would indicate a predominant Arabic influence.

A specimen may be given of the nature of these *Carmina Samaritana* by a translation of a few of the opening stanzas of the first of them:—

There is no God save one: (1) Creator of the World,
Who can measure Thy Greatness? Thou hast wrought in majesty
In the space of six days.

(2) In Thy Law, great and true, We read and become wise;
In each of those days Thou didst magnify Thy creative Power.

(3) Made great in Thy Wisdom, They proclaim Thy Excellency.
They reveal Thy Divine Power; Nothing is unless to magnify
Thee.

(4) Thou hast created Thy glorious works Without weariness.
Thou hast drawn them forth from nothingness, In the space of six days.

(5) Thou hast created them perfect; There is not defect in one of them.
Thou hast shown forth their perfection to be seen, Because Thou art the Lord of Perfection.

(6) Thou didst rest without weariness On the seventh day;
Thou madest it a crown For the six days.

(7) Thou didst call it holy, Thou madest it head,
The time of every convocation, Chief of all holiness.

(8) Thou didst make it a covenant Between Thyself and Thy worshippers;
Thou didst teach them To guard its observance strictly.

(9) Happy they who celebrate the Sabbath, Who are worthy of its blessing.
Its holy shade makes them breathe again, Free from all labour and fatigue.

(10) With glorious gifts Our Lord has honoured us,
He gave to us the Sabbath day At length we rest since God has prepared quiet.

The poet next glorifies the Law and Moses through whom it had been revealed.

The last verse may be translated as exhibiting the place ascribed to Moses:—

(22) An Ocean of Speech, Did Divine Excellence make Moses,
The end of Revelation is Moses, The end of the Revelation of our Lord.

Of the rest of these hymns the most interesting is one by a certain Abu'l Fath[1] relating the sufferings endured by the Samaritans from their persecutors; it is numbered V. in Gesenius' collection. We subjoin a few stanzas from it:—

(5) If there is no helper for us, He Himself will afford us aid.
O merciful King, Pity our humiliation.

---

[1] It is not clear whether this is the historian or not.

(6) We are Thy servants, The sons of Thy Servants ;
Be it far from Thee That Thou shouldest forget Thy covenants with our ancestors.

(7) We take refuge in Thy favour From the midst of our mighty oppressors.

The above examples may be held as sufficient to give an idea of the hymns of the Samaritans.

Some poetic fragments, hymns for circumcision, marriage songs, etc., were discovered by Merx in the library of Gotha, but do not call for remark. The same scholar also found a poem on the Thaheb, the Samaritan Messiah. Its value is more theological than literary.

The prose literature of the Samaritans is mainly represented by the theologian Marqah. As with the last cited poem, the value of his treatises is mainly theological. The style is rather rhapsodical than even rhetorical. Marqah's *Book of Wonders* begins thus :

> "Great is the might of the Omnipotent.
> Let us clothe ourselves with fear lest we be destroyed.
> No secret is hid from Him, and all is in His power.
> He knows what is, what was, and what will be.
> Of Himself is His might, He has need of no other."

If this is compared with the treatises in the Mishna, which were probably nearly contemporary with Marqah's literary activity, the wide difference between their literary atmosphere is observable. Marqah had not gone to school with the Jewish Rabbis.

In verse, the Samaritans owed little to the Jews. The ruling feature of Jewish versification was parallelism, but there is no trace of it as a constituent part of the verse of the Samaritans. On the other hand, the Samaritans used rhyme as a vehicle for their poetic expression of which the Jews did not make use until late times. Both they and the Jews had a favour for the alphabetic acrostic; and both occasionally used the refrain. Still these are not the essentials of verse; in all three, the Samaritans followed other models than the Jews. If they did not follow the Jews

in matters of literary form, still less were they likely to do so in religion.

Literary activity has ceased for centuries among the Samaritans. Latterly they have been especially impoverished. All their later work, as mentioned above, has been in Arabic.

[PARADIGMS OF VERBAL FORMS

PARADIGMS OF VERBAL FORMS.

		SAMARITAN.		HEBREW.		CHALDEE.	
		Sing.		*Sing.*		*Sing.*	
Preterite.	3 *m.*	קְטַל	qᵉṭal.	קָטַל	qaṭal.	קְטַל	qᵉṭal.
	f.	קִטְלַת	qiṭlath.	קָטְלָה	qaṭlah.	קִטְלַת	qiṭlath.
	2 *m.*	קְטַלְתְּ	qᵉṭalt.	קָטַלְתָּ	qaṭalta.	קְטַלְתְּ	qᵉṭalt.
	f.	קְטַלְתִּי	qᵉṭalti.	קָטַלְתְּ	qaṭalt.	קְטַלְתְּ	qᵉṭalt.
	1 *c.*	קְטַלְתִּי	qᵉṭalti.	קָטַלְתִּי	qaṭalti.		
		קְטֶלֶת	qiṭleth.			קִטְלֵת	qiṭleth.
		Plur.		*Plur.*		*Plur.*	
	3 *m.*	קְטָלוּ	qᵉṭalu.	קָטְלוּ	qaṭlu.	קְטַלוּ	qᵉṭalu.
	f.	קְטָלִי	qᵉṭali.			קְטָלָא	qᵉṭala.
	2 *m.*	קְטַלְתּוּן	qᵉṭaltun.	קְטַלְתֶּם	qᵉṭaltem.	קְטַלְתּוּן	qᵉṭaltun.
	f.	קְטַלְתִּין	qᵉṭalten.	קְטַלְתֶּן	qᵉṭalten.	קְטַלְתֵּן	qᵉṭalten.
	1 *c.*	קְטַלְנָן	qᵉṭalnan.	קָטַלְנוּ	qaṭalnu.	קְטַלְנָא	qᵉṭalna.
		Sing.		*Sing.*		*Sing.*	
Fut. and	3 *m.*	יְקְטֶל	yiqṭul.	יִקְטֹל	yiqṭol.	יְקְטֶל	yiqṭul.
Impf.	*f.*	תְּקְטֶל	tiqṭul.	תִּקְטֹל	tiqṭol.	תְּקְטֶל	tiqṭul.
	2 *m.*	תְּקְטֶל	tiqṭul.	תִּקְטֹל	tiqṭol.	תְּקְטֶל	tiqṭul.
	f.	תְּקְטְלִי	tiqṭli.	תִּקְטְלִי	tiqṭli.	תְּקְטְלִין	tiqṭlin.
	1 *c.*	אֶקְטֶל	eqṭul.	אֶקְטֹל	eqṭol.	אֶקְטֶל	eqṭul.

		Plur.	
3 *m.*	יִקְטְלוּן	yiqṭlu.	יִקְטְלוּן yiqṭlun.
f.	תִּקְטוֹלְנָה	tiqṭolna.	יִקְטֹלְן yiqṭlan.
2 *m*	תִּקְטְלוּ	tiqṭlu.	תִּקְטְלוּן tiqṭlun.
f.	תִּקְטֹלְנָה	tiqṭolna.	תִּקְטֹלְן tiqṭlan.
1 *c.*	נִקְטוֹל	niqṭol.	נִקְטֶל niqṭul.
Inf.	קְטוֹל	qeṭol.	
	מִקְטַל	miqṭal.	מִקְטַל miqṭal.
		Sing.	
Imp. 2 *m.*	קְטֹל	qeṭol.	קְטֶל qeṭul.
f.	קִטְלִי	qiṭli.	קְטֶלִי qeṭuli.
		Plur.	
2 *m.*	קְטְלוּ	qeṭlu.	קְטֶלוּ qeṭulu.
f.	קְטֹלְנָה	qeṭolna.	קְטֶלְנָא qeṭulna.
Part. act.	קָטֵל	qoṭel.	קָטֶל qaṭel.
pass.	קְטִיל	qaṭul.	קְטִיל qeṭil.

NOMINAL SUFFIXES: POSSESSIVE.

To Nouns Singular

SAMARITAN.				HEBREW.		CHALDEE.		
Sing.				*Sing.*		*Sing.*		
1st per.	*c.*	ִי	i.	ִי	i.	ִי	i	*my.*
2nd per.	*m.*	ךָ	eka.	ךָ	eka.	ךָ	ak	*thy.*
	f.	יִךְ	ek.	ךְ	ek.	יִךְ, ךְ	ek, ik	*thy.*
3rd. per.	*m.*	הִ	eh.	וֹ, הוּ	ehu, o.	הִ	eh	*his.*
	f.	הָ	ah.	הָ	ah.	הָ	ah	*her.*
Plur.				*Plur.*		*Plur.*		
1st per.	*c.*	נָן, נוּ	nu, nan.	נוּ	enu.	נָא	ana	*our.*
2nd per.	*m.*	כוֹן	ekon.	כֶם	ekem.	כוֹם, כוֹן	ekon, ekom	*your.*
	f.	כֵין	eken.	כֶן	eken.	כֵן	eken	*your.*
3rd per.	*m.*	הוֹן, ין	on, hon.	ימוֹ, ם	emo, am.	הוֹן	ehon	*their.*
	f.	הֵין, ין	en, hen.	ן	an.	הֵין	ehen	*their.*

NOMINAL SUFFIXES: POSSESSIVE—*continued.*

TO NOUNS PLURAL.

		SAMARITAN.	HEBREW.	CHALDEE.	
		Sing.	*Sing.*	*Sing.*	
1st per.	c.	ai.	ai.	ai	*my.*
2nd per.	m.	ek.	aka.	ayk, ak.	*thy.*
	f.	ak. ik.	ayik.	ayk, ak.	*thy.*
3rd per.	m	û, eh.	hu, o.	ohi	*his.*
	f.	ah.	ah.	aha, ah.	*her.*
		Plur.	*Plur.*	*Plur.*	
1st per.	c.	inan, nan.	enu.	aina	*our.*
2nd per.	m.	ekon.	ekem.	ekon	*your.*
	f.	eken.	eken.	eken	*your.*
3rd per.	m.	eon.	ehem.	ehon	*their.*
	f.	(en, eu.)	ehen, an.	ehen	*their.*

SUFFIXES VERBAL OBJECTIVE.

		SAMARITAN.		HEBREW.		CHALDEE.	
		Sing.		*Sing.*		*Sing.*	
1st per.	*c.*	ִי ִנ ִי	ni, i.	ִנ ִי	ni.	ִנ ִי	ni *me.*
2nd per.	*m.*	ִד ִה ִ:	k, ᵉka.	ִה ִ:	ᵉka.	ִה ִך	ak *thee.*
	f.	ִה	ik.	ִה ִ..	ek.	ִה ִ..	ek *thee.*
3rd per.	*m.*	ה	h.	ו הו	hu, o.	ה ִ.. חי	eh, hi *him.*
	f.	ה	h.	ה ִך	ah.	ה ִך	ah *her.*
		Plur.		*Plur.*		*Plur.*	
1st per.	*c.*	ן ִנ נו ִך	nu, nan.	נו ִך	anu.	נא ִך נא ִך	ana, na *us.*
2nd per.	*m.*	כון	kon.	כם ִ:	ᵉkem.	כון	kon *you.*
	f.	כן	ken.	כן ִ:	ᵉken.	כן	ken *you.*
3rd per.	*m.*	ן נון	nun, un.	ם ִך	am.	נון	nun *them.*
	f.	ן ִנ ִך	nan.	ן ִך	an.	ין ִנ	nen *them.*

CHAPTER X

COMPARISON OF THE SAMARITAN PENTATEUCH WITH THE MASSORETIC

ABOUT three centuries ago an Italian nobleman, Pietro della Valle by name, determined to make a prolonged tour in the East. In the beginning of his journey he passed through Constantinople; while there he was entertained by the French Ambassador, a man interested in scholarship; he suggested to Della Valle that he should, if possible, secure a copy of the Samaritan Recension of the Pentateuch. Mindful of this, when he reached Cairo, Della Valle endeavoured to induce some member of the Samaritan community there to sell him a copy of their Torah, but not one would part with a copy on any consideration. He proceeded to Gaza, but with the Samaritan community there his efforts were equally fruitless. The same was the case in Nablus. At length in Damascus he succeeded in procuring two copies, one of which found its way to the Royal Library in Paris, now the Bibliothèque Nationale, where it still may be seen. The other was sent to the Vatican. The text, as represented by the Parisian copy, was printed under the editorship of Morinus, a pervert from Protestantism. The controversy between Roman Catholic and Protestant had at that time reached an acute stage. The Thirty Years' War had just begun, and the two parties were specially embittered against each other. Morinus, emphasizing the difference between the two recensions, demanded of the Protestants which of the two represented the genuine Word of God, claiming that the Church alone had the authority to decide. He was answered by numerous Protestant scholars, all of whom maintained that the Samaritan Recension was late

and worthless. Some like the younger Buxtorf, in their eagerness to rebut the claim to antiquity put forward in favour of the Samaritan drawn from the script in which it was written, went so far as to declare, against the evidence of the Jews themselves, that the Law was originally written in the square character. These discussions, which went on for a couple of centuries, proceeded mainly on *a priori* grounds, and were therefore for scholarship practically valueless. At length a serious attempt was made to estimate scientifically the nature and extent of the differences between the two recensions. Little more than a century ago, in the year 1815, Gesenius, in proceeding to the degree of Doctor of Theology, presented, as his Thesis, a short treatise entitled, *de Pentateuchi Samaritani Origine Indole et Auctoritate*, to which there has already been reference. In it he removed the question into a new region; putting their theological bearings to one side, he proceeded to examine the differences themselves, their number, extent, and character. Gesenius, good Protestant as he was, assumed without further ado that the Massoretic text was the primitive, and that the Samaritan text arose from it by intentional variation. As nearly all the more recent investigators have been non-Catholic, and the majority of them Jews, it is not surprising that the same assumption has been implicit in them all. It scarcely needs argument to show that such a procedure is eminently unscientific. In the pages which follow we shall endeavour to avoid any presumption in favour of one or other.

It is very difficult to see why, in determining the relation between the Samaritan and the Massoretic, the critical school, who treat the Massoretic text with such slight respect sometimes, are so enamoured of it, when the question as to the relative priority or the dependence of the one on the other has to be considered. The Massoretic text appears to have been gradually evolved. The distinction between the *qri* and the *k'thib*, between what ought to be read and what is written, is familiar to every one; even the youngest student of the Hebrew Scripture is soon made aware of this. The origin of this requires to be explained. That which has to be "written" has frequent blunders which,

however, are in the main corrected in the *qri*, that which has to be "read." This perpetuation of blunders which are known, and duly corrected in each copy, seems only explicable on the idea that some one roll of the Law, some one roll of the Prophets, and some one roll of the K'thubhim had for some reason become sacrosanct, perhaps from having been the property of some much venerated Rabbi; its very blunders, though recognised to be blunders, are hallowed by the roll in which they occur. Another manuscript, or perhaps two, suggested the correct reading. There may be a well-grounded suspicion that many blunders may have been retained because the manuscripts which supplied the *qri* agreed in the blunder with that which was copied in the *k'thibh*. That this singular amalgam of blunders and corrections was the result of a process may be proved by comparison of the Massoretic with the text behind the older versions. Although the Torah was regarded as the most sacred portion of the Scripture, and therefore one should have expected that it would be most carefully copied, and most sedulously kept free of errors; yet in the Pentateuch there are a larger number of recognised blunders in proportion than in any other part of Scripture. When the versions are brought into comparison, it is found that the older the version the further it is from the Massoretic. The oldest version is that of the LXX. The differences between the text behind it and the Massoretic are extensive and well known. An interval of several centuries separates the Septuagint from the next Greek translations. With regard to two of these, by Aquila and Symmachus, only fragments have been preserved, and these mainly in quotations; hence no absolutely trustworthy evidence can be drawn from them as to what relation the text from which they translated bore to the Massoretic. In regard to Theodotion, we have the advantage of possessing a complete book, the book of Daniel, in his translation. The result of a study of Theodotion serves to show that while his version has been made from a text much nearer to the Massoretic than that behind the Septuagint, it still was one which differed considerably from it. Nearly contemporary with Theodotion, but not improbably

somewhat earlier, is the Peshitta of the Old Testament. Theodotion's version seems to have been made in the first half of the second century of our era, which is a not improbable date for the Peshitta of the New Testament; but the language of the Peshitta of the Old Testament appears to be older, so it may quite well be dated in the latter half of the first century. The relation of the Peshitta to the Massoretic is much closer than is Theodotion's. The latest of the older versions is the Vulgate, the work of St Jerome, written in Palestine in the fifth century; its evidence is specially valuable. Jerome was a scholar and gave all diligence and used every assistance to get the exact text and the precise meaning of every passage. Over and above his version, he wrote commentaries on a number of the books of the Old Testament, and in these there are many textual notes; we can thus form a pretty clear idea of the text in his day. In regard to the Psalms we have not only his revision of the Latin Psalter then in use—a version of the Septuagint—but the version which he made direct from the Hebrew, and thus can measure the change which the Hebrew text had undergone in the interval. While the text which Jerome used is much closer to the Massoretic than that behind Theodotion, it still is far from being absolutely identical with it. For one thing, the distinction between *qri* and *k'thibh* does not seem to have been known to him or to the Rabbin, his instructors, in Palestine. There are two cases in which the *qri* is most illuminative in which the scribe of the *k'thibh* has written לֹא *lo*, "not," instead לוֹ *lo*, "to him"; in both cases the blunder is corrected by the *qri*. The instances are Is. ix. 3 and Ps. c. 3. In regard to the first of these, "Thou hast multiplied the people and hast *not* increased the joy," Jerome in his commentary recognises the difficulty but shows no knowledge of the way of escape to be found in the *qri*. He would explain the apparent contradiction by instancing the perpetual grief of the Apostles over the impenitence of Israel, though converts were multiplied. With regard to the Hundredth Psalm, Jerome's own version is placed in a column parallel to that in which is printed his amended version of the LXX. In his own

version he renders the clause in question — *Deus, ipse fecit nos et ipsius sumus.* The conclusion to which we feel obliged to come is that in Jerome's days the Massoretic text had not been reached. The fact that the Peshitta, though probably earlier than Theodotion, is closer to the Massoretic, suggests that the model manuscript on which the *k'thibh* is based must have been written in Babylon. The close agreement of the Targum of Onkelos may be explained by its Babylonian origin, or at least sanction. From this it will be seen that the Massoretic text is late and not by any means very accurate. There is therefore no ground for assuming, as do so many of the students of the Samaritan question, that the Massoretic represents the primitive text.

The variants which exist between the Samaritan and the Massoretic are very numerous, but of very different value. The student may find a convenient list of them in the beginning of Bagster's Hebrew Bible. It labours under one disadvantage, that it has been made from the text in Walton's Polyglot, which is very defective; the editor seems to have had a perverse preference for the worse reading in every case. The number of the differences may be estimated when it is seen that they occupy fifty pages in the beginning of Bagster's Hebrew Bible. Another list available for the student is that by Petermann appended to his *Versuch einer Heb. Formenl. nach der Aussprache der heutig. Samaritaner* and occupies 108 pages. The disadvantage with regard to Petermann's list is that the Samaritan text implied in it does not in every case agree with the text of Genesis, which he has transcribed to show the Samaritan pronunciation. With the two, however, the student is in a position to consider the variants. Blayney's transcription of the Samaritan of the Polyglot text is valuable still, although it occasionally adds blunders of its own to those of Walton's text. Much better is the careful text of von Gall.

As a suitable introduction to the study of these differences between the Samaritan and Massoretic texts, since it will exhibit the general nature and relative frequency of them, it would seem advisable to take a limited portion of the

Pentateuch, note in it the successive examples of divergence as they occur, and then consider their nature. As the portion of the Hebrew Scripture most likely to be familiar to those who read the original, the first chapter of Genesis may be taken. As it is convenient we may make use of Bagster's list. The first difference noted is that the Massoretic begins with a large ב, whereas in the Samaritan the opening ב is of the same size as the other letters. So natural is it to us to emphasize the beginning of a book or of a section of a book by using a large, perhaps ornamental, letter that the large ב would not be recognised as a peculiarity, were it not for the Massoretic note which draws attention to it. On looking through the Hebrew Bible it will be found that only other three books, Proverbs, Song of Solomon, and first Chronicles begin with large letters. The next variant is found in verse 11, where in the Samaritan ו "and" is inserted before עֵץ *aytz*, "a tree"; the English versions insert "and" here. It is to be noted that this "and" is supplied in all versions, ancient and modern. In the same verse י in מַזְרִיעַ *mazria'*, "a seeding seed" is dropped in the Samaritan; this involves a change of conjugation from Hiphil to Piel. Elsewhere in Scripture there is no instance of the participle of either conjugation of this verb; the imperfect of the Hiphil occurs in Lev. xii. 2, the preterite Pual, the passive of the Piel, is found in Is. xl. 24. As the variation involves no change of meaning, the versions do not decide. In verse 14 there are four variants; first the Hebrew word for "lights" is written *plene* in the Samaritan with all the *matres lectionis* מְאוֹרוֹת instead of מְאֹרֹת as in the Massoretic; second, in the Samaritan there is a clause added לְהָאִיר עַל הָאָרֶץ *leha'eer 'al ha'aretz*, "to give light upon the earth," which is not in the Massoretic; in this the Samaritan has the support of the LXX., according to the text of Brooke and Maclean, and the Vulgate; fourth, the Samaritan writes the vowels in *'othoth*, "signs," *plene* in both cases, whereas in the Massoretic the *matres lectionis* are omitted. The only difference in verse 15 is that the Samaritan writes both syllables of the word "lights" *plene*, but the Massoretic so writes only the first. In the next verse the Samaritan writes the word

just mentioned as it has already done; the Massoretic has no *vav* at all. There are three other differences due to blunders of the scribes of some Samaritan MSS., but the best do not have them, although Walton has them in the Polyglot; they are not parts of the genuine Samaritan text. The second syllable of the word *gadhol* is *plene* in the Samaritan. Verse 20 varies from the rule; generally the Samaritan has a tendency to fill in the *matres lectionis*, while with the Massoretic the tendency is to omit; in this verse the word for "flying" is written *plene* in the Massoretic but *defective* in the Samaritan. There are three variants in the next verse; two of them are merely the insertion of *vav;* the third is ם instead of שׁ but it is found only in one MS.; it is a blunder of hearing. For the Jussive form of the imperfect Hiphil of the verb רָבַב in the Massoretic the Samaritan has in verse 22 the simple imperfect of the Hiphil. There is in verse 24 what Gesenius regarded as an archaic construct in וּ in the Massoretic; this the Samaritan omits. It is possible that what was originally written was the ordinary archaic *construct* in י modified by blunder into וּ, from the practical identity of these two letters in the early square script, as evidenced by the Kefr Bir'im inscription. In Samaria the archaic form had fallen out of use. There is another thing to be noted, which suggests another possible explanation; the *vav* omitted is compensated by the insertion of the article before אֶרֶץ *aretz*, a change which further assimilates the construction to that of later classic Hebrew as seen in the following verse. This would suggest that the supposed archaism is due to the blunder of a Jewish scribe, who, copying into square character a manuscript in Samaritan script, and mistaking *he* for *vav*, letters very like in some forms of Samaritan, transferred what was the article prefixed to *eretz* to the end of the preceding word. This explanation is rendered all the more probable by the fact that so the clause is identical with the parallel clause in verse 25. In verse 26 while the Massoretic writes כִּדְמוּתֵנוּ in one MS. the Samaritan drops the *vav*. In verse 28 the Samaritan correctly has *shureq* instead of *kibbutz* in the word כִּבְשֻׁהָ and the article is inserted before חַיָּה and after כֹּל.

In the next verse, the Samaritan omits and the Massoretic inserts the article in precisely similar circumstances. In the 30th verse the Samaritan has the article before רוּמֶשׁ but has not ו in the first syllable; the Massoretic omits the article but writes the first syllable *plene*. As the first three verses of chapter ii. belong really to the same document as chapter i., the variant in them may be noted. There is only one, but it is more important than those preceding; where, in verse 2, the Massoretic has "seventh" and the Samaritan has "sixth," in this supported by the LXX. and the Peshitta. As mentioned above, Petermann gives a slightly more numerous list of variants, though omitting some that are in Bagster's list. While these differences are fairly numerous, they are in the main unimportant; indeed, only a very few of them cause any difference in translation.

Although in the main so unimportant, these variants are so numerous and differ so much in value and character that a classification of them is necessary; to be understood, they must be grouped. This necessity becomes all the more obvious when study is extended over the whole Pentateuch. Gesenius saw this, and in his famous dissertation made an elaborate classification of these variants, which has been the basis of all subsequent attempts. He arranged them in eight classes. (1) Emendations to make the text agree with the laws of ordinary grammar. (2) Glosses or explanations received into the text. (3) Conjectural emendations of passages which labour under some verbal difficulty, real or imaginary. (4) Readings corrected or supplemented from parallel passages. (5) Larger additions interpolated from parallel passages. (6) Emendations of passages which labour under some difficulty as to matters of fact, chiefly of a historical kind. (7) Forms of words altered into agreement with the Samaritan dialect. (8) Finally; Passages conformed to the theology and modes of interpretation peculiar to the Samaritans.

The great and undeniable debt which Semitic scholarship, especially so far as it relates to Samaritan, owes to Gesenius must not make us blind to the defects of the above classification, or shun the duty of criticising it. It must be remembered, on the one hand, that he wrote a hundred

years ago when the bitterness of the controversy between Protestantism and Catholicism had not quite disappeared; and on the other, that during the century which has elapsed many things, bearing on the subject under consideration, have been discovered.

The first thing to be noted as obvious in this classification is the unscientific assumption, which has been referred to above, that the Massoretic text is the primitive. Gesenius, in an earlier portion of his Thesis (p. 16), asserts that the Samaritan text was derived from a manuscript written in square character, brought to Samaria in the age of Alexander the Great. Had he known certain facts when he was composing his Thesis, which came within his ken later, or had he properly estimated facts which were open to his knowledge, he would have seen that these two assumptions were in conflict one with another. If the MS. was written in square character, it could not have been conveyed to Samaria in the days of Alexander, as that script was not introduced till half a millennium after the Macedonian Conquest. Historical difficulties connected with that date fall to be considered elsewhere. Gesenius had the Maccabæan coins within his reach, and might have known that the inscriptions on them were in a script akin to that of the Samaritan manuscripts, and consequently that centuries after Alexander the Jews themselves did not use the square character.

Even a cursory study of this classification shows it to be very defective, merely as a classification. In fact, it has as many defects as a classification can have. It is in the first place defective, because it takes no note of the huge majority of variants which are due, not to intention, but to accident. It is redundant; class 5 is contained under class 4. It has no principle according to which the classes are arranged, and consequently it is confused; the eighth class—passages conformed to Samaritan tenets and modes of interpretation—differs more in motive from the other classes than they do from each other; much more, for instance, than the third and sixth, or the fourth and fifth differ from each other. The classes 1, 3, and 6 all contain emendations to escape difficulties, grammatical, verbal, or historical; the fourth and fifth contain cases in which supplements are made to the text from

parallel passages, and differ from each other only in the size of the supplement. Class 2, like classes 4 and 5, consists of additions to the text, but the source of these additions is not parallel passages.

Defective as is the classification of Gesenius, still more so is that of Kirchheim, as given by Deutsch in his article on the "Samaritan Pentateuch" in Smith's *Dictionary of the Bible*. His classes are thirteen: (1) Additions and alterations in favour of Mount Gerizim. (2) Additions for the purpose of completion. (3) Commentary. (4) Change of verbs and moods. (5) Change of nouns. (6) Emendations of seeming irregularities. (7) Permutations of letters. (8) Of pronouns. (9) Of gender. (10) Letters added. (11) Addition of letters which are prepositions, conjunctions, the article, etc. (12) Junction of words that are separated in the Massoretic, and separation of those that are joined. (13) Chronological alterations. The enumeration of the classes in this classification is sufficient to condemn it; comment is scarcely needed. The want of any class for blunders, as distinct from intentional alterations, the utter want of any principle of classification, the want of any attempt at equipollence of classes, or distinction of one from another, so that one should not overlap another, all these things make the classification of Kirchheim even worse than that of Gesenius. Perhaps the worst attempt at classification is that of Kohn. It was suggested by him as an improvement on that of Gesenius by being a condensation of it. He reduces the classes of Gesenius to three: (1) Words which are expressed in Samaritan forms. (2) Diverse corrections and emendations. (3) Glosses and corruptions feigned on account of religion. It will be observed that the second class really contains all the others. Like the classification of Gesenius on which it was intended to be an improvement, this of Kohn's assumes that the Massoretic is always correct, and further, that all variations from it are due to intention. It is clear that no classification can be satisfactory that makes these two preliminary assumptions.

As Unity of Principle is necessary to any logical scheme of classification, a little consideration will show that the most natural principle for this purpose must be founded in Origin;

that is to say, that the variants should be classified in accordance with the sources from which they resulted. This at once suggests a primary division into two leading classes; first, Variants due to Accident, and next, Variants due to Intention. The first class of variants, those due to Accident, are usually denominated Blunders, and neglected. In many cases "blunders" may be neglected; if the object be to find out the true text of a classic, blunders may very generally be neglected. Yet even in regard to this, at times the true text may be arrived at as being that from which given blunders could most easily spring. But to the critic who desires to discover the conditions under which the MS. which he is studying was produced, "blunders" are often invaluable. Thus in Greek manuscripts, the phenomenon of *itacism* proves that the MS. which shows many traces of it had been written to dictation, and that the reader spoke a dialect of Greek which made no distinction between η and $\epsilon\iota$, etc. In short, as blunders are usually due to external circumstances, they not infrequently throw some light on the nature of these circumstances, consequently they sometimes may supply the critic with a clue to the date of a document, and to its place of origin.

Variants due to Accident.—To understand the origin of the accidental differences which characterise the two recensions —the blunders, whether made by Samaritan or Jewish scribes, which distinguish the one from the other—we must consider the conditions under which ancient manuscripts were produced. The picture which rises before the mind of a modern reader, when manuscripts and copyists are spoken of, is of a youth, large-eyed and emaciated, with a single roll before him, copying it, by the light of a suspended lamp, into another parchment roll. This was doubtless the way many of the copies of classical authors were made by the mediæval monks. The majority of the MSS. of an older date present many phenomena, which cannot be explained on the supposition that this was the way in which they were produced. Mistakes due to the confusion of letters that resembled might be understood on this supposition; but it would not explain how words and letters, which as written had no resemblance, were confused one with another, when they sounded alike.

This implies that the majority of ancient MSS. were written by amanuenses to dictation. It must be remembered that though books were dearer in the early centuries than they are now, they yet were much cheaper than they would have been had they been copied directly. A publisher in the first Christian century managed things differently; he had a score or more of slaves, who were trained scribes, and further, he had a reader, who dictated from a manuscript before him to the scribes who wrote. There would thus be a considerable saving of time and labour in the production of MSS., and consequently a cheapening of their price. If the reader in such a manufactory of MSS. spoke at a time indistinctly, or if any of the copyists had defective hearing, one letter might easily be mistaken for another, and words having a general resemblance might be confused; all the more readily as the scribes would write mechanically, without any regard to the meaning. Further, the MS. before the reader might have become somewhat rubbed, or it may have been indistinctly written at first, and the distinctions between resembling letters so little emphasized, that one might easily be mistaken for another. The reader, too, would become liable to read mechanically, and words that had a general resemblance might be confounded in defiance of sense. These mistakes of the reader would be repeated in all the twenty copies. Again, if two successive sentences began with the same words, or ended with the same words, a confusion might be caused which would result in the omission of one of them. Yet another source of blunder has to be considered. When a sentence begins in a way that suggests a customary ending, though as a matter of fact it ends differently, reader and writer alike are liable, from inattention, to follow the customary. When the passage read is a long one, a scribe may omit a word or two, or again might inadvertently use a synonym for the word really dictated. We have thus under the head of Accidental Variants to consider those due to mistakes (1) of hearing; (2) of sight; (3) of defective attention.

(1) A comparison of the Samaritan text with that of the Massoretes reveals the fact that the gutturals עחהא are specially liable to confusion. Thus, one of the sons of Benjamin is called חֻפִּים "Huppim" (Gen. xlvi. 21) (Masso-

retic), but in the Samaritan the name is written אֶפִּים; in this case, א and ה are interchanged. Another example of this is to be found in Gen. xxvii. 36; instead of אֲצַלְתָּ as in the Massoretic meaning "reserved or left," the Samaritan has הִצַּלְתָּ "delivered," "snatched away from." Although, as it is the more picturesque version, there might be a *primâ facie* probability in favour of the Samaritan, the fact that the LXX. is against it, may be held as decisive. This confusion of the gutturals is more strikingly seen in the Samaritan hymns, many of which are alphabetic; many of them begin with ע instead of א. This is due to the fact, commented on in a previous chapter, that the Samaritans omit the gutturals when they read Hebrew. When the extant Samaritan MSS. were written, Hebrew had ceased to be understood, at least by the class from which the scribes would be taken, consequently the guttural they wrote, to the silence of the reader, might be chosen at times haphazard. Sometimes gutturals are inserted by the Samaritan scribes in cases where they do not appear in the Massoretic, as in Gen. xlvi. 16, where the Samaritan has אצבעון for the Massoretic אְצְבֹן; or again, a guttural present in the Massoretic is omitted by the Samaritan as in Gen. xlviii. 16, instead of the Massoretic מלאך "angel," the Samaritan has מלך "a king." Though the Israelites of the Southern Kingdom did not labour under the same disability in regard to the gutturals that the Samaritans did, even with them there is an occasional uncertainty in the matter of these letters. In Exod. iii. 2, the Massoretic reads בְּלַבַּת "in a flame," instead of בלהבת as in the Samaritan. Another case of an inserted or dropped guttural is to be found in Exod. xiv. 27, "And the Egyptians fled נַסִּים against it" לִקְרָאתוֹ (literally "to meet it"). Instead of *nasim* the Samaritan reads נסעים *nas'im* "marching." Although the Massoretic is supported by the versions, a fair case might be made out for the Samaritan. In this instance either the Massoretic has dropped an *ain*, or the Samaritan has inserted it.

Deutsch accuses the Samaritans of confusing the *ahevi* letters. This accusation is due to ignorance or forgetfulness; the first two of these letters are gutturals; the confusion in regard to the latter two is to be sought among the Jewish scribes rather than among those of Samaria. Cases, where in the Samaritan *he* and *vav* are confused, are due to the likeness of these two letters in the Samaritan script.[1] Other groups of letters are liable to be confused; thus the "linguals" *daleth*, *teth*, and *tau* are at times confused in individual MSS. among the Samaritans. An example of this is to be found in Gen. x. 3, where instead of רִיפַת (Massoretic), the Samaritan has רפד. In Gen. xv. 10 Walton's text has בטרו instead of בתרו as in the Massoretic. As שׂ and ס became identical in sound, it is not to be wondered at that in some cases they are interchanged as in Gen. xlii. 25, where in Walton's text סקו stands for שקו of the Massoretic. As it involves another class of consonants, Gen. xxxi. 33 may be referred to; in Walton's text, instead of חָפַשׂ "to search," which is in accordance with the Septuagint (the word is omitted from the Massoretic) there is found חָבַשׂ "to bind." In this case, Walton's text has the support of only one MS. These are specimens of the variants to be ascribed to mistakes in hearing; such mistakes, however, it ought to be understood, are not confined to the Samaritan scribes.

(2) We have now to consider the second class of accidental variations; those due to mistaking one letter for another which resembles it in appearance. Pairs of letters so like as to be confused in one script are not at all liable to be confused in another: thus ה and ח are very like in the square character, but in the Samaritan they are unlike : still less are these letters like in the script of the Hasmonæan coins ; in the angular script which preceded these last-named scripts, the unlikeness is also marked . *Yodh* and *tzade* are very similar in Samaritan , but do

[1] Confusions in that script sometimes involved more of these letters. Gesenius in his introduction to his *Carmina Samaritana* (p. 6) speaks of a manuscript in which the three letters *he*, *vav*, and *yodh* are so much alike *ut ægre dignoscantur* "that with difficulty they can be distinguished."

not resemble each other in the square character (י ו), nor in the early angular 𐤉 𐤅. Some letters are like in two scripts; thus *daleth* and *resh* (ד ר) resemble each other in the square character, and also in the angular 𐤃 𐤓, but the likeness is not so great in the Samaritan ⟨ⵔ ⵕ⟩. Further, the evolution of the angular script was a process, the various stages of which may be traced. From the date of the Moabite Stone, inscribed in the days of Jehoram the son of Ahab, to that of the inscription on the sarcophagus of Ashmunazar, the contemporary of the younger Cyrus, is a period of nearly half a millennium. Examination shows that, while some of the letters remained unchanged, others altered very materially.

As a stream, ere it reaches the sea, is prone to carry along with it, and hold in solution something of all the different soils through which it has passed; so a manuscript of the Old Testament Scripture in the square character, however late, may bear in it traces of each successive transcription, and of each successive script. The origin of mistakes in a manuscript which seem to be due to confusions of letters like each other in an ancient script, is not disproved by the presence in it of blunders due to resemblances in characters which belong to a later script. Although every individual manuscript must be dated by the latest script found in it, the matter of the document, the contents of the writing inscribed on it, must have its chronological position fixed by the earliest.

Some critics, and among the rest, as has already been observed, Gesenius, maintain that certain of the differences between the two recensions are due to confusion of letters like each other in the square character, and consequently they hold that the Samaritan Pentateuch was copied into the Samaritan script from a manuscript written in the square character. This opinion can only be defended on the presumption that the Samaritan script is more recent than the square, which no one can maintain in face of the fact that the Jews themselves maintain the contrary (*Sanh.* 21*b*). The letters singled out by Gesenius as those which have been confused in transcription in consequence of their likeness in

the square character are ד *daleth* and ר *resh*, ה *he* and ח *ḥeth*, ו *vav* and י *yodh*. As to the first of these pairs, they are like not only in the square character but also in the angular. Such differences as may be due to confusions of these letters must be ascribed to transcription from a manuscript in the script of the Moabite Stone, not from one written in the square character, which would be too late. The cases in which *he* and *ḥeth* are confused are due to mistakes of hearing, not of sight. There remain only *yodh* and *vav*. These letters do not resemble each other in any other script than the square. A careful examination of the instances of such confusion proves that they are all due to the blunders of the scribe to whom we owe the manuscript which is perpetuated in the *k'thibh* of the Massoretic text. In a very considerable number of cases, the blunder is acknowledged by the *qri* being in agreement with the Samaritan; in some other cases, the Septuagint bears evidence to the correctness of the Samaritan reading. The first instance selected by Gesenius is peculiarly unfortunate for his contention; in Gen. x. 28 he maintains there has been a confusion between the letters in question, as the Samaritan reads עֵיבַל *eval*, and the Massoretic reads עוּבַל *uval*. In the parallel passage, 1 Chron. i. 22, the Samaritan reading is found. The LXX. had the same reading in their Hebrew, as they render Εὔαλ. In chapter xxxvi. 14, the *qri* corrects a blunder of the *k'thibh*, in writing יעוּשׁ instead of יְעוּשׁ with the Samaritan and the LXX. Another case in which the Massoretic has *vav* and the Samaritan *yodh* is Gen. xlvi. 30; the Massoretic has the inf. רְאוֹתִי instead of the 1st pers. pret.; the similar clauses in Gen. vii. 1; xvi. 13; the probability is that there the change was on the side of the Massoretic. A similar case is Exod. xiii. 22, in which the Massoretic reads יָמִישׁ instead of יָמוּשׁ as does the Samaritan, supported in this by the LXX. and adopted by the R.V. In this case the difference of meaning between the two words does not alter the sense of the passage; it amounts to the same thing whether JHWH (understood) is considered the nominative and the verbal form taken as the Hiphil, so that the clause read, "He did not remove the pillar of cloud," or, as in the Samaritan, the verb be taken in the Kal and

the clause read, "the pillar of cloud departed not." In another passage in which the same difference exists, Exod. xxxiii. 11, every version, including the Targum of Onkelos, supports the Samaritan; it would look something like nonsense to introduce JHWH as "not removing" Joshua from the tabernacle. In regard to proper names, no decision can be come to when both recensions are consistent. In the case of Peniel (Gen. xxxii. 30) the Samaritan has Penuel, but though the Massoretic has Peniel in verse 30, in the following verse it has the Samaritan form; it appears also in Judges viii. 8. There is thus no instance in which it can be proved that the Samaritan scribes have confused *vav* with *yodh;* on the other hand, there are several instances in which confusion of these letters by Jewish scribes can be demonstrated. Hence, there is no evidence that the Samaritan text is dependent on a mother text in the square character.

There are in the text of Walton's Polyglot, especially as represented by Blayney's transcription, a number of cases in which the differences from the Massoretic appear to be due to confusions of letters similar only in the Samaritan script. Every one of these may be proved to be confined to one or two MSS. They are not given in Petermann's transcription, nor are they found in his list of variants; von Gall has them not. It follows from this that the variations involving mistakes due to the Samaritan script are late, and have originated long after the two recensions had separated. There are indications that one at least of the ancestors of the manuscript, from which the *k'thibh* of the Massoretic has been copied, was written in the Samaritan script. These are not so numerous as to suggest that the common ancestor of both recensions was written in it.

Older than the Samaritan character is the script which is found in Hebrew and Aramaic inscriptions all over South-Western Asia, from the Euphrates on the east, the Taurus Mountains on the north, Cyprus on the west, and the Arabian desert on the south. It is to be admitted that all the examples of this script are inscriptions; and that no manuscripts, either on parchment or papyrus in this script, have been preserved. The ostraka recently found in the foundations of Ahab's palace show it in a somewhat cursive

form. A careful study of the Siloam inscription shows that the script in which it is written has had, for its model, writing with a reed on papyrus or ostrakon. It has also to be acknowledged that the script of the papyri found in Assouan and Elephantine differs very much from that of the Mesha and Siloam inscriptions. There is, however, no indication that this Egyptian script was ever generally used in Palestine; further the Samaritan script does not seem to have sprung from it.

Are there traces, in the variants which separate the recension of the Massoretes from the Samaritan, of these being caused by confusions of letters in this angular script? The pair of letters most frequently confounded are ד *daleth* and ר *resh*. As mentioned above, Gesenius brings forward confusions in regard to these two letters as evidence that the mother MS. of the Samaritan Recension was copied from one written in the square character. But the Jews themselves regard the Samaritan script as older than the square character; hence it is out of court. The script next earlier is that found on the Maccabæan coins. It is, as is well known, closely akin to the Samaritan script. In it, the two letters in question are not confusingly alike, as may be seen by comparing them on the tables of alphabets (p. 222). The latest date advanced for the conveyance of the Jewish Pentateuch to Samaria is the reign of Alexander the Great (*circa* 332 B.C.). The earliest examples of what may be called the Samaritan script are the coins of Simon the Maccabee (*circa* 140 B.C.), nearly two centuries after Alexander. The latest instance of the angular is the inscription on the sarcophagus of Ashmunazar, of which the date is 399 B.C., or two generations before Alexander. But the angular script itself has a long history; hence in considering resemblances of letters and consequent confusions, the date at which certain characters were like must be taken into account. In all forms of the angular, however, *daleth* and *resh* closely resemble each other. The first instance of confusion of these is in Gen. x. 4 where דֳּדָנִים "Dodanim" of the Massoretic appears as in the Samaritan רוֹדָנִים "Rodanim." In this case, the Samaritan has the support of the LXX.;

further, when the name recurs in 1 Chron. i. 7, it has the Samaritan form. Although it was the Palestinian reading as early as the fourth century, since it is adopted by Jerome, the Massoretic text is clearly incorrect; indeed this is admitted by Gesenius. Another passage in which in its difference from the Massoretic, in regard to these two letters, the Samaritan has the support of the LXX. is Gen. xlvii. 21. In E.V. the passage is rendered: "As for the people, he removed them to the cities from one end of the border of Egypt even unto the other end thereof." The Samaritan reads: "The people he enslaved from one end of the boundary of Egypt to the other end thereof." The difference involves the third and fifth words העביד אתו לעבדים instead of as in the Massoretic העביר אתו לערים. As will be seen, the difference in the first of these words is in the last letter, which is ר *resh* in the Massoretic and ד *daleth* in the Samaritan. In the last, the difference is greater; not only is there the confusion between ר and ד in the radical before ים of the plural, but either the Massoretic has dropped a ב or the Samaritan has inserted it. Jerome supports the Samaritan; a fact indicating that the Palestinian text in his day agreed in reading with the Samaritan. The Peshitta follows the Massoretic, a fact which must be held as supporting the idea, above indicated, that the Massoretic originated with the Babylonian school. The Samaritan reading carries on the process narrated in the preceding verses; the Egyptians had successively sold their cattle and their land to Pharaoh, the next step was to sell themselves. In verse 25 they acquiesce in their bondage: "Thou hast saved our lives, let us find grace in the sight of my Lord and we will be Pharaoh's servants." The Massoretic implies that the Egyptians had not dwelt in cities before the governorship of Joseph. The periodic flood of the Nile would necessitate life in cities, or at least villages, from the very first. Another passage involving the same word is Lev. xviii. 21: "Thou shalt not give any of thy seed to make them pass through *the fire* to Molech." The Samaritan reads: "Thou shalt not give of thy seed to be enslaved to Molech (or to a king)." The Septuagint renders: "Thou shalt not give from thy seed to serve the ruler (ἄρχοντι)."

Jerome renders: "Thou shalt not give of thy seed to be consecrated to the idol Molech." This was evidently the Palestinian reading of the fourth century A.D., as Jerome follows the Massoretic vocalisation in the last word. It is needless, however, to go over all the interchanges of these two letters—interchanges which Gesenius holds to be the "most frequent of all." Before we leave consideration of these cases, however, there are two passages in which the difference appears to be due to the resemblance of these letters, but which is really to be explained otherwise. In Gen. xlix. 7, instead of ארור "cursed," the Samaritan has אדיר "mighty"; this does not seem due to accidental confusion but rather to intention, to avoid bringing the tribe of Levi under a curse. The other case, Gen. x. 19, is somewhat confused, and appears rather to be the result of defective attention, started possibly by confounding ד and ר. Even if there were no other cases, those we have adduced prove that the mother roll must have been written in the angular script. But, as shown above, the angular script had a lengthened history during which some of the letters underwent considerable modifications, consequently investigation must be pursued further. The two letters the confusion of which has just been considered, while very like in the Ashmunazar inscription, and in those of Sinjirli, differ observably on the Moabite Stone, and in the Ba'al-Lebanon inscription. As Ashmunazar died only sixty-six years before the advent of Alexander in Palestine, the evidence afforded by mistakes involving ד and ר is rather palæographic than historic.

There are, however, other letters in the angular script which resemble each other closely, and do so in the angular alone. Thus *mem* and *nun* do not resemble each other at all either in the square character or the Samaritan, but do so in the earlier form of angular, as seen in the Ba'al-Lebanon, Mesha, and Siloam inscriptions. The likeness is not so great as to be confusing on the Tabnit and Ashmunazar sarcophagi, which are four or five centuries later. The most frequently recurring instance of the confusion of these two letters appears in the name of Jacob's youngest son; in the Samaritan he is invariably called

Benjamim, whereas in the Massoretic he is as regularly denominated *Benjamin*. Although this variation must have originated in a blunder on one side or other, the fact that both forms have a significant and suitable etymology may explain the perpetuation of both; if the Massoretic name means "the Son of the Right Hand," *i.e.*, the favourite, the Samaritan means "the Son of Days," either referring to him as the son of his father's old age, or a prophecy of love that, though so early bereft of his mother, his life would be long. Another instance is *Pithon* in the Samaritan for *Pithom* (Exod. i. 11); as in this case the Massoretic form is in closer agreement with the Egyptian, it is probably the primitive. In Num. xxxii. 35 is another case; one of the towns assigned by Moses to the tribe of Gad is called Shophan in the Massoretic, but Shuphim in the Samaritan. In this case, the Septuagint shows Sophar, a reading that on the whole rather points to the Massoretic; the Peshitta has Shuphom; Jerome agrees with the Massoretic. One more case may be instanced which is interesting as involving not only a confusion of *mem* and *nun* but also of *caph* and *vav*. The passage is Deut. xii. 21; while the Massoretic reads לָשׂוּם *lasum*, "to place," the Samaritan has לְשַׁכֵּן *leshakkên*, "to cause to dwell." As has been shown above, *mem* and *nun* resemble each other in the script of the Moabite Stone and of the Siloam inscription; but further, *caph* and *vav* are also resemblant in that script, though not so closely, 𐤊 and 𐤅. A confusion between another pair of letters is seen in Num. xxx. 9, where the Samaritan has או *'o*, "or," and the Massoretic ואת *veth*, the sign of the acc.; here the letters confused are *tau* and *vav;* the *tau* of the Ba'al-Lebanon inscription resembles the *vav* of that of Siloam; *vav* does not occur in the Ba'al-Lebanon inscription.

There is in Gen. xxxi. 53 what seems to be a confusion between י *yodh* and ר *resh*, letters which do not markedly resemble each other in any known script; אביהם in the Massoretic becoming אברהם in the Samaritan. It will be seen later, however, that this is really a blunder springing from another source.

From all this it may be regarded as certain that at the time when the two recensions diverged, the mode of

writing commonly used was akin to that of the inscription on the stele of Mesha of Moab, and of the Siloam inscription; in other words, the mother roll from which ultimately both the Samaritan and the Massoretic have been copied must have been written in the angular script. But this script, as has been already remarked, had a history. When it was introduced cannot be fixed even approximately. The earliest inscription extant shows an alphabet that has long passed beyond the hieroglyphic stage. The sweeping curves to be found in even the earliest of these indicate that the stone-cutter was reproducing a mode of writing which had attained its form from having been written with a reed on parchment or papyrus. It seems probable that while the chiefs were corresponding with the Egyptian court in the diplomatic tongue of Babylon, and using the cuneiform script on clay tablets, native scribes were evolving, for native needs, the characters inscribed on the jars of the wine-cellar of Ahab. The progress of evolution may be seen in regard to some of those letters liable to be confused; thus *daleth* is in the Ba'al-Lebanon inscription and that on the Moabite Stone a simple triangle, and so less likely to be confused with *resh* which always has the right-hand side prolonged. But in Sinjirli a hundred years later, and in the Siloam inscription about fifty years later still, the two letters by the modification of the *daleth* have become indistinguishable. In regard to *mem* and *nun;* these are like in the earliest forms of the angular script as in the Sinjirli inscriptions, that of Siloam, and that on the Moabite Stone, whereas, in the inscriptions on the sarcophagi of Tabnit and his son Ashmunazar, there is little resemblance between them. This would imply that somewhere between the time of Ahab, the contemporary of Mesha, and the fall of the Northern Kingdom the divergence took place. The common exemplar from which both recensions have sprung must be dated still earlier; but how much so we have no data to go upon. It is held by Colonel Conder that the earliest form in which the Pentateuch appeared was in cuneiform on clay tablets; in this view he has been followed by Dr Winckler, without acknowledgment. This, however, must have been in a period long previous to the divergence of the recensions.

(3) There now remains the third class of unintentional variations to be considered, those due to defective attention. These are not so important, both because they are very generally restricted to one or two MSS., and are not common to the whole recension, and because no deduction as to date can be made from them; inattention is confined to no century. These mistakes take various forms; sometimes transposition of letters in a word, sometimes of words in a sentence. If the reader did not know Hebrew very well, he might reverse the letters by mispronunciation; or reading carelessly, might change the order of the words; or the scribe writing mechanically, hearing correctly enough, might yet modify what he heard. These are some of the more common forms in which these variants occur. Thus, in Gen. xxviii. 20, the Samaritan of Walton's text has יעבק *ya'baq*, instead of יעקב *ya'qob*; in this case, the great majority of the Samaritan MSS. support the Massoretic. A similar case is found in Num. iv. 6 in which the Massoretic has בֶּגֶד *beged*, but the Samaritan of Walton's text בֶּדַג *bedag*; in this case also the great majority of the Samaritan MSS. support the Massoretic. The same may be said of Num. xix. 3 in which in the Polyglot text שָׁחַט *shaḥaṭ*, "to slay," of the Massoretic is replaced by שָׁטַח *shaṭaḥ*, "to spread"; in this case, the Polyglot text has the support of only one MS. In the case of Deut. xii. 17, Walton's text, on the authority of one MS., has the meaningless לאלך *le'lok*, instead of לֶאֱכֹל *le'kol*, "to eat." In the case of פראן (Samaritan) and פארן (Massoretic), Paran (Gen. xxi. 21, Num. x. 12), a good deal could be said for the Samaritan reading being the more probable; "the place of wild asses" rather than the "place of beauty." In this case, therefore, the change may be laid to the door of the Massoretic. In Exod. xl. 3 there is a case of transposition of letters, but it is not impossible that it has been the result of intention; the Samaritan has כַּפֹּרֶת *kapporeth*, "Mercy-seat," while the Massoretic has פָּרֹכֶת *paroketh*, "vail"; in this it has the support of all the versions. The clause is rendered in the A.V.: "Thou shalt cover the ark with the vail"; instead of the last word, the Samaritan has "with the Mercy-seat." It is obvious that the

"vail" did not cover the "ark," and that the "Mercy-seat did. Moreover, the verb סָכַךְ *sukak*, "to cover," is used of the cherubim (1 Kings viii. 7). The omission of any reference in the Massoretic to the Mercy-seat which occupied such an important part in the great Day of Atonement is to be noted. It would seem probable that the transposition of the letters is due to a blunder of an ancient Jewish scribe. This variant suggests that the divergence of the two recensions took place before the translation of the Septuagint.

There are a few instances in which the order of the words has been changed. In Gen. xii. 16 the Massoretic, as rendered by the A.V., is: "He (Abraham) had sheep and oxen, and he-asses and men-servants, and maid-servants and she-asses, and camels." The Samaritan reads: "He had sheep and oxen, exceeding much property, and men-servants and maid-servants, and he-asses and she-asses, and camels." Although the LXX., the Peshitta, and the Vulgate support the Massoretic, the order is evidently the result of blunder. This would tend to support the opinion that the divergence of the two recensions is to be dated before the translation of the Torah into Greek. The next cases, Gen. xxxiv. 12 and Exod. xxix. 18, involve no change of meaning. In Lev. vii. 29 there is a transposition which involves a change in construction but not of meaning. There are several unimportant variants which may be passed over. The order in which the daughters of Zelophehad are named in Num. xxxvi. 11 is different in the Massoretic from that in which they appear in the three other instances in which they are enumerated; the Samaritan has the same order in all four cases. Although the LXX. to some extent agrees with the Massoretic, the variation seems to have been the result of inattention on the part of the Massoretic scribe or reader. One more instance of transposition may be referred to, Deut. iii. 19; in this case, the Massoretic has arranged the terms in the natural order: "Wives, little ones, cattle," whereas the Samaritan puts "little ones" first. In this case, the blunder has been on the side of the Samaritan scribe. There are other but less important instances of alteration of order in the names of the nations that were to be cast out before the children of Israel, *e.g.*, Exod. xxiii. 28.

Another class of unintentional variation due to inattention are those in which synonyms are interchanged. The most frequent are those in which the prepositions על and אל are put the one for the other. Though they are not precisely synonymous they are nearly so; it is impossible to give more than examples in which either אל of the Massoretic is represented by על in the Samaritan, *e.g.*, Gen. xxxvii. 35, xlii. 25, Exod. xxviii. 7, or the converse as in Exod. xxv. 37. Another set of approximate synonyms is formed by אמר *'amar*, and דבר *dabhar*, e.g., Exod. ix. 1 (Samaritan) has אמרת instead of דברת as in the Massoretic, whereas in Lev. xx. 1 the converse appears. Two terms, the interchange of which has caused some controversy, are the Divine names אֱלֹהִים "Elohim" and יְהוָה "JHWH." The cases of this substitution are not very numerous, not numerous enough to affect seriously the question regarding the Pentateuchal documents, *e.g.*, Exod. iii. 4 (Samaritan) has אלהים "Elohim" instead of יהוה "JHWH," and in Exod. vi. 2 the converse is found. Other instances might be noticed, as Exod. i. 18, in which the Samaritan has "Pharaoh," while the Massoretic gives "King of Egypt"; and ii. 10, in which *na'ar*, "youth" (Samaritan), represents *yalad*, "boy" (Massoretic). These variations may most easily be explained by a momentary inattention on the part of the reader or scribe, whether Jewish or Samaritan.

Another class of variants is that in which either ordinary additions, which in a given case ought to be omitted, are inserted; or conversely, a customary addition may be omitted where it ought to be inserted. A not infrequent addition to the covenant name JHWH is "thy God"; in Deut. vi. 12 and 18, the Samaritan inserts this, but the Massoretic omits it. In regard to the land of Canaan, the epithet "good" is followed by the further epithet "broad" in Exod. iii. 8 in both recensions; in Deut. viii. 7 the Samaritan alone has the second epithet, agreeing in this with the Septuagint. Sometimes the additions are of greater length; in Gen. i. 14 the Samaritan, in agreement with the LXX., inserts as the primary purpose of the "greater lights" being set in the firmament "to give light upon the earth" as in the verse which follows; Jerome and the Peshitta agree with the

Massoretic. Another case is specially interesting, as it is one of the few in which Gesenius acknowledges that the Samaritan has preserved the correct reading. In Gen. iv. 8, after the words rendered, "And Cain talked with Abel his brother," the Samaritan inserts, "Let us go into the field"; all the versions in this support the Samaritan. In Gen. xliii. 28 the Samaritan and the LXX. narrate that when Joseph's brethren informed him that his father was yet alive, he answered, "Blessed be that man with God."[1] As there does not seem to be any motive for the insertion of the phrase, a phrase which might be omitted without marring the sense, it probably is genuine as it might have been accidentally omitted by the Massoretic scribe. Where two successive clauses begin with the same word, the reader might unconsciously omit one of them; thus, in Exod. iii. 22, the word מאת, occurring in two successive clauses, seems to have led to the omission of the words, "A man shall ask of his neighbour" preceding "and a woman shall ask of her neighbour." The insertion may of course have been occasioned by the reader feeling it difficult to understand how all the "borrowing" could be done only by women; and so may have been an intentional addition.

In Gen. x. 19, there is a passage which, while difficult to understand in either recension, seems explicable in both cases only on the supposition of more than one cause of blunder being at work. The Massoretic text is rendered in our A.V. "The boundary of the Canaanite was from Zidon as thou comest to Gerar unto Gaza, as thou goest to Sodom and Gomorrah, and Admah and Zeboim, even unto Lasha." The confusion in the passage is to some extent hidden in this rendering, as the word for "comest" is the same as is translated "goest" in the following. The probable meaning is that "as thou goest Gerarwards" was equivalent to going to the south, and that the southward progress was to stop

[1] A very similar phrase occurs not infrequently in the *Tarikh* of Samaritan codices of the Torah, or in the records of their purchase when the name is mentioned of some deceased ancestors of the scribe or purchaser. This fact may be regarded as militating against the authenticity of the sentence. But the fact that it is found in the Septuagint is strong evidence in its favour.

at Gaza, whence the boundary line turned eastward to the valley of the Jordan. The expression found in the Samaritan is: "The boundary of the Canaanite was from the river of Egypt to the Great River, the river Euphrates, even unto the hinder sea." In comparing these two, one thing is clear; to begin with, מצדן has been confused with מצרים; here then *daleth* and *resh* and *mem* and *nun* have been mistaken one for the other. The concluding phrase in each of the versions recurs elsewhere; the concluding enumeration of the cities of the plain in the Massoretic is in the stereotyped order which is found in Deut. xxix. 23, and with the addition of the royal names in Gen. xiv. 1; the concluding phrase of the Samaritan is found in Gen. xv. 18. Whichever is the primitive, the latter portion of the other is due to scribal inattention, ending a sentence not in accordance with what was the true ending but with a customary formula. Although it might be argued that because *minnahar* began with the same letter as Mitzraim, it might be passed over by the reader; still the balance of probability seems to be that it was the Samaritan reader who took refuge in a formula.

The varieties of accidental variants, which we have just been considering, have differing degrees and directions of evidential value. Mistakes due to deficient attention, whether on the part of the reader or the scribe, have, as has already been indicated, little value as evidences of date, since mistakes due to this cause do not differ in character from age to age. Mistakes due to mishearing, as they reveal peculiarities of pronunciation, which may to some extent be dated, have more value. It is, however, mainly to mistakes due to confusing one letter with another like it that most definite information may be gleaned. In regard to the chronology of Semitic scripts, there is now a body of inscriptions extending over more than a millennium.

Variants due to Intention.—All variations of one recension from the other are not to be put down to inadvertence; in not a few cases, the intention of the scribe or reader may be traced. When, however, the term "intention" is used, there are to be included semi-conscious acts of tongue and eye in dictating from a manuscript, and the equally semi-conscious action of the hand of the scribe in writing to dictation. A

person reading from a document written in an archaic style would be prone to correct ancient grammatical constructions into those in common use. Thus a person reading from a manuscript written in the language of our Authorised Version would be prone, when he came to cases in which the relative "which" was used of persons, to correct it into "who." The scribe, writing to dictation, if accustomed to spell correctly according to modern usage, would be apt to continue to do so, although he may have got general directions as to the antique mode of orthography. This is the result of habit; and habit is the result, built into the system, physical and mental, of repeated acts of intention, which have been completed in action. Variants with such an origin may be looked upon as the indirect products of intention. But there are also cases of difference which must be due to direct intention.

The variations between the Samaritan Recension and that of the Massoretes due to purpose, direct or indirect, may be arranged under three heads:—(1) Grammatical corrections of archaic spelling, verbal forms, and forms of nouns, usually classed under accidence and syntax. (2) Logical corrections. Under this head would be classified the removal of contradictions actual or only apparent, by modification of statement, or by additions. In the case of words which had fallen in repute so that the employment of them involved a sin against propriety, these were changed into others not under this condemnation. Such alterations might be regarded as due to rhetoric, were it worth while to form such a class. (3) Doctrinal or theological corrections. Under this category fall to be considered not only such phrases as have a special bearing on the tenets of the Jews or Samaritans respectively, but also such as they held in common, as the Unity, the Spirituality, and absolute Supremacy of JHWH. In considering each of these classes of variants, it is incumbent on the investigator to beware of assuming that it necessarily was the Samaritan which varied from the Massoretic, as if it were the primitive form of the text.

(1) Intentional Variants affecting Grammar. The fact that syntax, accidence, and orthography, all three, are the

result and expression of custom, renders it possible that geographical situation as well as point of time may have had to do with any given variation. There are evidences that in the days of Queen Anne certain words were pronounced differently from what they are now, differences which affected the spelling; for instance, such words as "frolic" and "public" had a final *k* added to emphasize the last syllable. Such features are liable to be removed in reprints. Sometimes peculiarities of spelling are regulated by geography, such words as "theatre" and "labour" are spelt differently in Britain and America; in reprints in one country of books published in the other, these differences are usually removed. Similar differences seem to have existed between the Northern and Southern Kingdoms of Israel. The peculiarity which differentiates the Samaritan orthography from that of Judea is its predilection for the introduction of *matres lectionis*, especially ו *vav* and י *yodh* to emphasize the *u* and *o* sounds, and the *e* (ee) and *a* (ay) sounds respectively. While in the majority of cases the Samaritan has these when they are wanting in the Massoretic, there are fairly numerous instances of the converse. The presence of *matres lectionis* is rarer the further back investigation is carried, till in the earliest inscriptions they are almost entirely absent. This would imply the relative recency of the Samaritan. Another peculiarity of the Samaritan, grammatical rather than orthographic, is the more regular use of את *eth* the sign of the accusative; though there are cases in which the Massoretic has this while the Samaritan omits it. According to Petermann's list, there are in Genesis twenty-five cases in which the Samaritan inserts את when it is omitted in the Massoretic, and there are three cases of the converse. Another common particle is the conjunction ו "and"; in Hebrew, when there is a list of substantives or adjectives, it is the rule to insert ו before each substantive or adjective, not merely before the last member of the list, as in the classic and modern European languages. Breaches of this rule are more frequent in the Massoretic than in the Samaritan; thus Gen. vi. 9, according to the Massoretic, the verse reads, "Noah was a man just, perfect in all his

generations"; the Samaritan inserts "and" between "just" and "perfect" as do our English versions. So in the following verse, "Noah begat three sons, Shem, Ham, and Japhet," the Samaritan inserts "and" before "Ham." While in this matter the Samaritan is generally more in accordance with ordinary Hebrew grammar, there are cases of the converse; thus, in Gen. ix. 5, the Massoretic reads "*and* at the hand of every man's brother," while the Samaritan omits "and." The tendency to omit particles is observable in every language as it grows in age. It would therefore seem more probable that the Jewish scribes omitted these particles with a subconscious intention than that the Samaritans inserted them. As to pronouns, the change of the usage in the two recensions took place as much in the southern district of Palestine as in the northern. In regard to the 1st pers. pron. sing., while generally agreeing with the Massoretic the Samaritan sometimes prefers the longer form when the Massoretic has the shorter, *e.g.*, Gen. xiv. 23.[1] A more frequent example of the preference shown by the Samaritan for the older and more lengthened forms is seen in the 1st and 2nd pers. pron. plur., in preference to the shorter as found in the Massoretic; this is noted by Gesenius, as in Gen. xlii. 11, Exod. xvi. 7, 8, Num. xxxii. 32. The Samaritan prefers the longer form of the 2nd pers. sing. fem. אַתִּי *atti* instead of אַתְּ *att;* this form is declared by Gesenius to be archaic. As already observed, all the cases where *atti* occurs in the rest of Scripture are connected with the North, except in two poetical passages in Jeremiah and Ezekiel. What was an archaism in Judah and the South was perpetuated in the ordinary speech of the North. In these cases, the correction and modernisation has taken place in the Massoretic, not in the Samaritan. The identification of the 3rd pers. pron. fem. with the 3rd mas. in the Massoretic is due to a blunder on the part of the scribe of the *k'thibh.* There are other pronouns in which the Samaritan differs from the Massoretic. While in the Massoretic הֵמָּה and הֵם are used indiscriminately, the longer form is in the Samaritan generally represented by the shorter; thus, in Gen. vi. 4, vii. 14, the

[1] According to the Polyglot text which Blayney follows without note; von Gall has אני.

Massoretic has הֵמָּה *hemma* and the Samaritan הֵם *em*. There is another pronominal form which is practically restricted to the Pentateuch, אֵל *el* for אֵלֶּה *eleh*; in the Samaritan it is invariably the longer form that is used. The evidence thus appears to be contradictory; though the longer forms are usually the more ancient and the shorter the more recent, the Samaritan prefers the shorter form of the 3rd pers. pron. plur. but the longer form of the dem. pron. plur. mas. No conclusion as to date can be drawn from these peculiarities, which are probably due to localisms.

In regard to pronominal suffixes, it would seem that the suffix of the 3rd mas. ה *oh* is really due to mistake on the part of the scribe of the *k'thibh*, who, copying from a MS. in Samaritan script, confused *vav* and *he*, as the Samaritan always has the regular suffix in ו *vav*. The rule with the prepositions עַל and אֵל is to insert *tsere* with *yodh* between the preposition and the suffix. In a number of cases in the Massoretic, the vowel is written *defective*, but never so in the Samaritan. This, however, is merely a matter of orthography; it only shows that the Samaritan was more carefully accurate than the Massoretic.

There is a difference in regard to nouns which forms a distinction between the two recensions. In the Massoretic, the noun נַעַר *na'ar*, "a youth," is epicene in the Massoretic of the Pentateuch; not, however, in the Samaritan in which, whenever the reference is to a young woman, the word is put in the feminine. It is to be observed that the *qri* makes the same correction of the Massoretic *k'thibh* as does the Samaritan.

Gesenius occupies a considerable section of his treatise with instances in which he assumes the Samaritan scribes to have assimilated the grammar of the Pentateuch to that of Samaria. He never considered the converse possibility, that the assimilation took place from the other side. We have elsewhere considered the question of the relative priority of *koth'noth*, "coats," in the Massoretic and *kith'noth* of the Samaritan, and concluded that on the whole the Samaritan was the more likely to be the primitive form. Another case is *q'dishim* (Samaritan) for *q'doshim* of the Massoretic. In this case, there probably was a difference

in the way the word was pronounced in the South and the North; there is no means of fixing which is the primitive; if the Samaritan suggests Aramaic affinities, the Massoretic hints at Arabian. It is to be observed that according to von Gall's text in every case noted by Gesenius the word קדשים is written *defective*. There is one case in which the contention of Gesenius appears to be justified; in Gen. xi. 3, by identifying *ḥēmer*, "bitumen," with *ḥomer*, "clay," the Samaritan has lost the point of the distinction between the two substances when used as mortar. Gesenius enumerates several other instances of what he regards as grammatical variations introduced by the Samaritan; sometimes one recension, sometimes the other, exhibits the more primitive form. From this it would seem probable that a process of change was going on both in the North and the South.

(2) Intentional Variations involving Logical Content. The same mental mood, which led the scribe, Jewish or Samaritan, to replace obsolete grammatical forms or modes of spelling by those in common use, led him occasionally to make changes of a more important character in which more than mere form was involved. Sometimes the change is occupied with individual words, omitting words that had become obsolete and so unintelligible, supplying words that seemed necessary to complete the sense, changing terms for their synonyms either where a repetition is presupposed (that the repetition should be obviously exact), or to vary the phraseology to avoid monotony. Sometimes where terms are ordinarily associated, if at a time one of these occurs alone, the other may be supplied. It is to be noted that all these cases may come under the category of the results of inattention, and be the consequence not of intention but of blunder through unconscious cerebration. The most important alterations are those made from a sense of what ought to be. Since there is always a dubiety as to the origin of variants belonging to the class at present under consideration, much time need not be occupied with them. As an example of a term which is ordinarily united with another, but which is omitted in one recension, supplied in

the other, Exod. vi. 27 may be taken; in the Massoretic of that passage, it is said, "These are they which spake to Pharaoh, King of Egypt, to bring out the children of Israel from Egypt"; the last clause in the Samaritan is "the land of Egypt"; in this case the insertion might be due to the mechanical completion of the customary phrase, or the reader might think the omission due to blunder and intentionally supply what had been omitted. Of course, *mutatis mutandis*, this applies also to the Massoretic reader or scribe. An instance of the converse is found in Exod. xi. 6 where the Massoretic has, "And there shall be a great cry in all the land of Egypt," but the Samaritan omits "all the land of." The arguments used in regard to the former passage apply to this also.

There are a few cases in which foreign words and names appear to be modified so as to give an appearance of intelligibility in Hebrew. The most interesting case is in regard to the name that Pharaoh gave to Joseph (Gen. xli. 45), which seems to have been modified in both recensions to emphasize the root צָפַן *tzaphan*, "to hide," from the idea that the name meant "revealer of secrets," as Onkelos and the Samaritan Targum translate it. Jerome renders it "Salvator Mundi."

The most important logical differences are those that rest on a theory of what ought to be. The earliest instance is Gen. ii. 2, where the Massoretic names "the seventh day" as that on which God finished the work of Creation, whereas the Samaritan, in this agreeing with the LXX., says "the sixth day." On whichever side lies the responsibility of the alteration, it must have been the result of intention. Either the Massoretic scribe or reader, finding "the sixth" set down as the day on which the Creator "finished His work," argued that the work could not be considered "finished" until "the sixth day" was ended, and therefore "the seventh" begun, altered the numeral accordingly; or the Samaritan scribe or reader, thinking that any work must be reckoned as finished on the last day in which he that wrought the work was engaged with it, changed the "seventh" of the MS. before him into "sixth." The probability is in favour of the Samaritan being the original, as both the LXX. and the

Peshitta have this reading. Jerome here follows the Massoretic.

In Gen. iv. 8—a case already referred to—after the words rendered "And Cain talked," or to translate the word in its ordinary meaning "said unto Abel his brother," the Samaritan followed by the LXX., the Peshitta, and the Vulgate, adds, "Let us go into the field." This has been regarded as an addition to the text in order to complete the sense; the natural explanation, however, is that the Massoretic scribe, misled by the word "field" standing at the end of both clauses, omitted the first of them; hence this ought rather to be reckoned among the blunders than among intended variations.

More important are the variants in regard to the ages of the antediluvian patriarchs. According to the Massoretic "the days of the life of Adam" were exceeded by the years of three of his descendants, Jared, Methuselah, and Noah; whereas in the Samaritan his life is longer than that of any of those dying before the Flood. Even in the Massoretic there is a general decline in age to Mahalaleel, with the exception of Cainan, whose life, while shorter by two years than his grandfather's, is seven years longer than that of his father. The Samaritan carries on the process of a progressively diminishing lifetime, Enoch being the only exception. Behind this arrangement there seems to be in the mind of the scribe the theory that the growing moral degradation would express itself in growing physical degeneracy, and that this would be exhibited in the shortening of life. In this the Samaritan has the support of none of the versions.

Another set of variants in which the Samaritan has not the support of the versions appears in the genealogy of the post-diluvian ancestors of Abraham (Gen. xi. 10-26). To bring this second genealogy into line with the earlier, to the years of the Patriarch's life after the birth of his eldest son, is subjoined the total number of the years of his life. It is possible that on the MS. from which the Samaritan was copied, a previous scribe had noted at the side of the column containing the text the total years of the life of each patriarch from Shem downwards, and that his successor had engrossed

it in the text. But it seems more probable that the Samaritan scribe or reader regarded this summation as a thing which ought to be there, and so supplied it. This at all events is more probable than that the summations should have been omitted either by accident or intention.

When the plagues of Egypt are recorded, in the Massoretic sometimes the actions of Moses and Aaron are described when the command is given them to go in to Pharaoh, sometimes it is given as the history of what they did. Thus in Exod. vii. 15-18, God commands Moses and Aaron to give to Pharaoh His message, and tells them to say to Pharaoh that if he will not let the people go, "I will smite with the rod that is in mine hand upon the waters which are in the river, and they shall be turned into blood." It is to be presumed that they did deliver this warning, but it is not expressly stated that they did so. In verse 19, without any word of Pharaoh's rejection of the warning, JHWH commands Moses and Aaron to carry the threat into execution. The lack is supplied by the Samaritan. This occurs also in the account of the plagues of frogs, flies, murrain, and hail. In the account of the eighth plague, that of the locusts, it is related that Moses and Aaron went in to Pharaoh, and threatened him with the coming of the locusts, but there is no word of JHWH having commanded them so to do; it is to be presumed that they had been so commanded, but it is not stated. Here again the Samaritan supplies the lack. The fact that in none of the versions the Samaritan additions are found, may seem conclusive against their authenticity: further there is the critical maxim that, other things being equal, the shorter reading is to be preferred. Too much stress must not be laid on these arguments against the Samaritan, because Oriental literature is too simple and naïve to expect deductions to be made. Thus in regard to Pharaoh's dream, it is first related in full when it appeared to the king; then when Joseph comes before him, Pharaoh himself tells it in almost the same words. This is precisely parallel with the method pursued by the Samaritan writer in the narrative of the plagues. Whether this is a case of omissions by the Massoretic or insertions by the Samaritan the divergence is the result of intentional variation.

There are also cases of intentional variations from harmonistic reasons. One of these may be given. When the Egyptian army is pursuing the Israelites, and has shut them in, with mountains on either side of them and the sea before them, cowering in terror the Israelites cry out (Exod. xiv. 12), "Is not this the word that we did tell thee in Egypt; let us alone that we may serve the Egyptians, for it is better for us that we should serve the Egyptians than that we should die in the wilderness." In the Massoretic text there is no account of this complaint ever having been made, but in the Samaritan there is an addition made to Exod. vi. 9. Moses had been telling the people that God would deliver them, and bring them to the heritage which He had promised to their fathers; "but they hearkened not to Moses from anguish of spirit and for cruel bondage"; at this point the Samaritan adds, "and they said to Moses, Let us alone that we may serve the Egyptians, for it is better for us to serve the Egyptians than that we should die in the wilderness." Although the versions agree with the Massoretic something may be said for the Samaritan. Another instance may be stated. A passage from Deuteronomy has been introduced into the account of Jethro's advice to Moses and his acceptance of it (Exod. xviii. 25), modified into the narrative style of Exodus in which Moses is always a person spoken of. This is done in preparation for the statement of Moses himself (Deut. i. 9-18). Less important and less numerous are the alterations made from reasons of propriety. In most of these cases, the Samaritan has put in the text what the Massoretic has in the *qri*.

(3) Intentional Variants involving Questions of Religious Doctrine. While changes which involve theological differences may be regarded as "logical," there is a difference sufficiently important to make it advisable to consider such cases under a separate head. With regard to logical variants, it is the form that is considered—the formal agreement of part with part; in the case of the theological variants, it is the matter—the content—that is important. The variants of this class have resulted from an effort to remove from the record everything which is, or seems to be, out of harmony with the religious systems of the readers contemplated. As

the doctrinal systems of the Jews and the Samaritans were in most essentials identical, these changes might as well have proceeded from the Jews as from the Samaritans. This may be seen by comparing the Samaritan Pentateuch with the Targums of Onkelos and of the pseudo-Jonathan. There is one point in which the Samaritans most distinctly differed from the Jews, the sanctity which the former ascribed to Mount Gerizim.

(*a*) Variants due to Doctrines common to the Jews and the Samaritans. The most prominent doctrine of Judaism, and therefore of the Samaritans, was the Unity of God. This doctrine is emphasised grammatically by the plural noun *Elohim*, when used of the Supreme, being joined to a singular verb. There are, however, four cases in the Massoretic Pentateuch in which the verb is plural, all which are corrected in the Samaritan. The first of these is Gen. xx. 13.[1] When Abraham tried to explain to Abimelech his equivocation regarding Sarah, he begins, "When God caused me to wander" הִתְעוּ the verb in this case is plural. All the versions have the singular; Onkelos has the plural, but inserts another nominative for the verb; he renders, "When the peoples went astray, etc." The reading of the Massoretic may be excused on the ground that Abraham, speaking to a polytheist, accommodated himself to him. Most probably, however, the plural is a mistake of the Massoretic scribe, who, reading from a MS. written in Samaritan script, substituted ו *vav* for ה *he*, as these characters are very like in Samaritan MSS.[2] This implies the Samaritan reading to be primitive. The same explanation is applicable to Gen. xxxv. 7. Another explanation may be given of Gen. xxxi. 53. Laban and Jacob swear by the "God of Abraham and the God of Nahor," and call upon God to judge between them; in this case, the verb is in the plural in the Massoretic but in the singular in the Samaritan. The alteration seems to have been made by the Jewish scribe unwilling to admit that the God of Nahor was the same as the God of Abraham. Another instance is found in

[1] This passage has already been referred to (Chap. VII., p. 176) in connection with Samaritan theology.

[2] For this, Gesenius himself is evidence in his prolegomena to the *Carmina Samaritana*, p. 6.

Exod. xxii. 8, 9, treating of theft of goods entrusted to another; in such a case, the person who had received the goods, from whose custody they were stolen, was to be brought אֶל־הָאֱלֹהִים which may mean either "to the judges" or "to God." The former rendering is that of the A.V., following the Peshitta and Onkelos; the Samaritan, by putting the verb in the singular, assumes the second to be the meaning; in this it is followed by the LXX. and the Revised. From the fact that in verse 11 in an analogous case "the oath of JHWH" being between the parties is supposed to conclude the matter, the alteration must be put to the credit of the Jewish scribe.

Belonging to the same class is the tendency to remove anthropomorphisms. These alterations are not so numerous as in the Targums. An example of this occurs in Exod. xv. 3, where JHWH is called אִישׁ מִלְחָמָה "a man of war"; this in the Samaritan is גִּיבּוֹר בַּמִּלְחָמָה "hero of war," a term applied to spiritual beings.

To maintain the majesty of JHWH, there is a tendency to introduce intermediaries between the Almighty and those with whom He has to do. When Balaam is brought to the mountain-top to curse Israel (Num. xxiii. 4), in the Massoretic it is said, "And God met Balaam"; in the Samaritan it reads, "The Angel of God found Balaam." See also verse 16 of the same chapter. In these instances Onkelos has "The word from the presence of the Lord." These cases have already been noted in another connection.

(*b*) Variants due to Doctrines peculiar to the Samaritans. All the essentially Samaritan doctrines centre round the supreme sanctity ascribed to Mount Gerizim. There are passages in the Samaritan Recension of the Pentateuch which affirm the unique position occupied by Gerizim; these are not found in the Massoretic. Sometimes the difference extends merely to a single word. The earliest instance of this appears in Gen. xxii. 2, where the Samaritan has "Moreh" מוֹרֶאה and the Massoretic "Moriah" מֹרִיָּה. (Dean Stanley here prefers the Samaritan reading.) When Abraham entered Palestine, he first settled at Shechem, at the foot

of Mount Gerizim; hence there is nothing intrinsically improbable in the idea that the mountain on which Isaac was to be offered should be "one of the mountains" in "the land of Moreh" instead of "the land of Moriah." The Peshitta in this case agrees with the Massoretic; but Jerome renders *in terram visionis*, a rendering which shows that he probably had the Samaritan reading. Consonantally, the Massoretic name suggests "contumacy" as that of the Samaritan suggests "vision." The reading of the LXX. suggests that in the text before the Alexandrian translators the first letters were transposed, for they translated τὴν γῆν ὑψηλὴν, "the Highland." Dean Stanley appears to think that geography suits the Samaritan reading; in his mapping out the days' journeys, in order to show that his theory squares with geography, the Dean forgets that Abraham was accompanied by a laden donkey, and that consequently his rate of travel would be at the ordinary muleteer's pace of three miles and a half an hour, and six hours a day. At that rate, starting from Beersheba and betaking himself to the Philistine Plain, it would be the morning of the fifth day, not the third, before he saw Mount Gerizim. Had Abraham been in Hebron, it would have been a different matter. Hebron is a full day's journey, at muleteer's pace, from Jerusalem; another long day would enable him to reach Lubban (Lebonah) from which Mount Gerizim would be in sight. It is clear then that if Abraham came from Beersheba it must have been Moriah to which he came, not to Mount Gerizim.

Sometimes the belief in the sanctity of their Holy Mountain has led the Samaritans to make more extensive additions to the text. There is inserted at the end of the decalogue (Exod. xx. 17): "And it shall be when JHWH thy God shall bring thee to the land of the Canaanite which thou art entering in to possess it, that thou shalt set up for thee great stones and shalt plaster them with plaster; and thou shalt write upon the stones all the words of this law; and it shall be when ye have crossed the Jordan that ye shall set up these stones, which I command thee this day, on Mount Gerizim. And thou shalt build there an altar to JHWH thy God; an altar of stones, thou shalt not lift iron

upon them. Of whole stones shalt thou build the altar of JHWH thy God. And thou shalt offer upon it sacrifices to JHWH thy God; and shalt sacrifice peace-offerings and eat there and rejoice before JHWH thy God. That mountain is on the other side of Jordan westward (after the way of the going down of the sun) in the land of the Canaanite who dwells in the desert over against Gilgal, beside the oak of Moreh over against Shechem." This passage, as is readily seen, agrees in the main with Deut. xxvii. 2-7; the most striking difference is that the mountain on which the stones are to be set up is Gerizim not Ebal. Another difference is that the land is called the "land of the Canaanite," and there is not a repetition of the description of it as "a land flowing with milk and honey"; this clause appears in its place when the passage is repeated in Deuteronomy by the Samaritan. It is to be observed that in the 12th verse of the chapter in Deuteronomy, Gerizim is the Mount of Blessing, whereas Ebal is that of Cursing; it might easily seem more natural that on the Mount of Blessing the memorial stones should be set up. The Massoretic scribe might as readily have made the change out of hatred to the Samaritans, as the Samaritan to glorify Mount Gerizim. The fact that, in the parallel passage in Deuteronomy, none of the versions agree with the Samaritan in reading Gerizim for Ebal may be regarded as conclusive. The insertion of this passage at this point, when "the children of Israel" were gathered at the foot of Mount Sinai, has not the geographical suitability which it has in Deuteronomy when it was delivered by Moses within sight of the twin mountains, Ebal and Gerizim, and where the superior height of Ebal would be observable. From such a position it would seem natural that on Ebal, as the most conspicuous mountain visible on the other side of Jordan, there should be set up the law-inscribed stones. Another result of this tendency is that, in the Samaritan, all the twenty passages in Deuteronomy in which the future national shrine is designated as "the place which JHWH thy God *shall* choose" have the verb in the preterite. This use of the preterite has an evident reference to the designation of Gerizim in Exod. xx. 17, Deut. v. 21, xxvii. 4, as the national sanctuary. In this change of the

future into the preterite, the Samaritan is without the support of the versions.

Even had the evidence from the versions not been so strong, the fact that, throughout the history of the Northern tribes, as recorded in the books of Kings, although there probably was a High Place on Mount Gerizim, it is not important enough to be mentioned, while Bethel, Dan, and Gilgal are repeatedly referred to, seems conclusive against the designation of "Gerizim" being part of the original text of the Torah. That David and Solomon chose Jerusalem as their capital, and Mount Moriah beside it as the site on which to erect the national shrine, might be explained by tribal preference; but even so it is hard to explain why the "Man after God's own heart" should deliberately arrange that his son should build the temple, not on the site prescribed by God but near his own palace on Mount Zion. When Jeroboam headed the revolt of the Ten Tribes, why did he not point to the passage in the Torah, and erect a temple on Mount Gerizim which could claim a sanction superior to that of Zion, rather than endeavour to prevent the worshippers from going to Zion by erecting shrines at Bethel and Dan? No one of the successive usurpers that mounted the throne of Israel ever thought of strengthening his position by building a temple on Mount Gerizim. These interpolations must have been made at earliest when Manasseh fled to his father-in-law Sanballat. Gesenius would place them much later, because the Talmud does not note them. The silence of the Talmud is no evidence; one needs only to read the Talmudic account of the Septuagint, and the alterations the translators are alleged to have introduced into the Torah to see that. Most of the variations which the Talmud says were introduced into the Septuagint are not to be found in it, as may be seen by any reader of the LXX.; on the other hand, there are scores of differences met with in every chapter which are not referred to.

To sum up: the relation of the two recensions to each other does not seem to be one of dependence, either of the Samaritan upon the Massoretic or *vice versâ*. As to the date of the divergence, a study of the various classes of

variants throws some light on this. The first leading class of variants comprises those due to mistake. Of these, the first group is formed by those due to mistakes in hearing. As has been seen, these are largely the result of the fact that the Samaritans did not, as they do not now, when reading Hebrew, pronounce the gutturals. This loss of the gutturals cannot have occurred under the Arab domination, or in consequence of it, for Arabic is peculiarly rich in gutturals. The Samaritans have spoken Arabic now for more than a millennium, and in doing so pronounce all the gutturals they eschew in reading Hebrew. Nor could it have occurred under the rule of the Greeks; they had the χ and the rough breathing, not to speak of γ, which, by the time of the Lagids, was pronounced like the Arabic *ghain*, as it is by the modern Greeks. Under the civil rule of Rome, the cultural influences were wholly Hellenic. Under the Persians, Aramaic was the language in which the rulers communicated with their subjects; it, too, is rich in gutturals. The Assyrians, though occasionally said to have no gutturals, had at least ח, as may be seen in the names Sennacherib and Esarhaddon. This peculiarity must thus go back before the days of Sargon. The Phœnicians were a nation who spoke Hebrew and like the Samaritans did not pronounce the gutturals. When they gave the Greeks the alphabet, they must have had no gutturals, as the Greeks had to make use of various devices to find symbols for their gutturals, while they occupied the guttural places in the alphabet by vowels, adopting for their symbols those used in Semitic languages for the omitted gutturals. In the time of Ahab, the Northern tribes were closely associated with the Phœnicians and had largely adopted their worship of Baal. That may be said to be an indication of a probable date.[1]

As to mistakes of sight, the second group of unintentional variants, these have had various origins. As has been shown above, all instances due to confusion of letters closely resembling in the square character, have been blunders made by Massoretic scribes. Those due to confusions

[1] This we have already indicated elsewhere in connection with the Samaritan pronunciation of Hebrew.

arising from resemblances in the Samaritan script are restricted to only a few of the Samaritan MSS. Inquiries are thus driven back to the script which preceded the Samaritan. It has been shown that some of the confusions have been due to resemblances only to be found in this angular script and to early forms of it, such as that on the Moabite Stone, in the Ba'al-Lebanon inscription, and in that in the Siloam conduit. This may be held as showing that in the ancestry of the manuscripts of the Samaritan Pentateuch there has been a stage in which the MSS. were written in an early form of the above-mentioned angular script. As this script has been found on the jar handles in the foundations of Ahab's palace, it would imply that the divergence must be dated as far back as the reign of the dynasty of Omri.

Mistakes due to inattention have not so much evidential value, as there is no chronology of carelessness. Yet, as has been seen, there are cases in which, to a limited extent, temporal data may be deduced: such are those in which the Samaritan has the better reading although all the versions agree with the Massoretic. This would prove that the divergence took place before the translation of the LXX. This fact, however, is now admitted, even by those who put the date of the Samaritan Recension at the latest. The earliest date claimed for the Septuagint is the reign of Ptolemæus Philadelphus, which began nearly half a century after Alexander's march through Palestine, and this, according to Josephus, synchronised with the flight of Manasseh from Jerusalem to Sanballat his father-in-law in Samaria, when it is alleged he took the Torah with him.

The intentional variants, whether due to desire to accommodate the grammar to later usage, to harmonise statements which seemed to be discrepant, or to conform the letter of the Torah more to their doctrinal ideas, while interesting, have less value as evidences of date. The fact that in both recensions there are archaic forms surviving, while both have removed several, proves not only the age of the whole document but dialectic differences between the North and the South. Since both sets of

archaisms are wanting in the rest of Scripture, something may be deduced as to the relative age of the Torah in relation to the other books. Variations due to harmonistic or theological intentions seem to be always owing to the Samaritan scribes.

CHAPTER XI

THE RELATION OF THE SAMARITAN RECENSION OF THE PENTATEUCH TO THE SEPTUAGINT

THE wisdom of the choice which Alexander the Great made of a site for the new capital of Egypt was manifested by the rapidity of its growth, and the great size to which it attained. It attracted all nationalities to it, so that it soon became the commercial and intellectual metropolis of the Greek world. Among the nationalities represented were the Jews. If we are to believe Josephus, they were out of all proportion the most numerous and influential. They formed one of the three great divisions of the inhabitants, the other two being Egyptians and Greeks. The Israelite inhabitants of Egypt were not confined to the colonists invited by Alexander, or to those compulsory colonists conveyed to Egypt by Ptolemæus Lagi as captives, on his conquest of Judea. There were Israelite communities, probably many of them, like that the existence of which we have learned from the Assouan papyri. From the days of Solomon downward, Egypt was the common refuge of every one who fell into bad odour in his home in Palestine. Before the advent of Alexander their language seems to have been Aramaic, although the presence of such large bands of Greek mercenaries, as are mentioned by Herodotus, would tend to make Greek very generally known among the business class, to which the Jews naturally belonged. At all events, surrounded by Greeks on every side, they very soon abandoned the Aramaic they had been accustomed to speak for the language of the conquerors.

While the Jews were, then as now, eager people of

business, they at the same time were zealous for their religion, and maintained it by the worship of the synagogue. As in Palestine, the reading of the Law in Hebrew would be accompanied by an interpretation in Aramaic. The general abandonment of Aramaic for Greek would soon render it as unintelligible as was the Hebrew of which it was the explanation. Certainly many of the Jews in Egypt continued to understand Aramaic, and wrote it, as is proved by the evidence of the ostraka and papyri which are so frequently turning up. Yet it would seem that in Alexandria, where Greek was the language of business and of social intercourse, many even of the learned class among the Jews understood neither Hebrew nor Aramaic. Philo, a learned and religious man, appears to have known no Hebrew, and as little Aramaic. A translation was therefore needed. When, however, it is remembered how extremely conservative all nations are, and in particular the Jews, in matters of religion, it would seem unlikely that they would of their own motion have thought of rendering the Law into Greek. It seems at least a probability that some external authority had stepped in. In a Jewish community as large as that in Alexandria which had a separate constitution, with an Alabarch, and probably a sanhedrin, questions of law would be continually emerging, and these would have to be decided by reference to the books of Moses. As the Jewish residents in Alexandria did not understand Hebrew, and the Aramaic Targum was not committed to writing, a translation was imperatively necessary, and would be demanded by the Egyptian authorities.

The story given by Aristeas and Aristobulus, that Ptolemæus Philadelphus, moved by Demetrius Phalereus, desired to add to his great library the Law of the Hebrews, and summoned seventy-two men from Jerusalem, selected by Eleazar the High Priest, to translate it, appears to be a highly ornamented version of a transaction that had some foundation in fact. We find the narrative also given in Josephus, repeated in a confused form in the Talmud, and in a shape scarcely less confused declaimed by the Christian Fathers. The greater care manifested in the translation of the Law, and its superior accuracy as a version, when

compared with the translations of the other books of the Hebrew Scriptures, makes the tradition at all events plausible, that the Law at least was translated into Greek at the instance of authority. At the same time, it does not seem likely that Philadelphus would send to Jerusalem for men to translate the Law into Greek, unless they were to be regarded as assessors to the Alexandrian translators, as guardians of the genuine Hebrew text, and guarantors for the accuracy of the translation. Something may be said for Eichhorn's theory that the seventy-two elders were the Sanhedrin of the Jewish community of Alexandria.

Whatever its historic origin, all over the Greek speaking world wherever there was a Jewish community—and that was practically in every important city of the Roman world—this Alexandrian translation was welcomed and generally used. It would seem to have been used in the synagogal readings, probably replacing the Targum. Even in Palestine, it may have been so used, at all events in synagogues formed for the accommodation of Greek speaking foreign Jews. A striking evidence of the general use of the Septuagint in Palestine is the fact that the evangelist Matthew, while he always translates from the Hebrew when he himself quotes from the Prophets or the Law, when our Lord is the speaker it is always from the Septuagint that He quotes. This cannot be explained by the fact that, as Matthew wrote in Aramaic, the Greek of the New Testament is a translation; for whoever the translator—it probably was Matthew himself—he must have had some reason for the distinction which he made; and the only likely reason is that it represented a fact. The Apostle Paul's use of the Septuagint in all his Epistles shows how universal was the acquaintance with it among the Jews all over the Greek speaking world, and that was practically the whole Roman Empire. Peter, who addresses his first Epistle to the whole Diaspora, also makes exclusive use of the Septuagint in his quotations from the Old Testament.

The relation of later Talmudic Judaism to the Septuagint is somewhat uncertain. Some of the Rabbin regard the translation of the Law into Greek as a disaster comparable to the dishonour done to the temple when Pompey pressed

into the Holy of Holies. Others again decided that while it was not lawful to translate the Torah into the tongues of the Gentiles, an exception ought to be made in regard to the tongue of the *Yavanim*. "Rabbi Shimeon ben Gamliel said it is permitted to translate the Law but only into Greek" (Megilla, 9*b*). The Talmudic account is founded on the story of Aristeas but modified *more Talmudico*. It immediately precedes the dictum above given. Tolmai brought from Jerusalem seventy and two elders and said to them, "write for me the Torah of Moses your Rabbi"; and they did so, but they varied from the original in fifteen different cases. Everybody knows that the points in which the Septuagint of the Pentateuch differs from the Massoretic are far more than fifteen. Singularly enough, of these fifteen cases, only three indubitably agree with any of the actual differences. The fifteenth case is interesting from its mingling of sense and nonsense. They did not, says the Talmud, write the word *arnebeth*, "hare," because the wife of Tolmai was so called, so they wrote instead *tzeerath ha-regaleem*, "smallness of feet." The latter word seems an attempt to transliterate, and at the same time make something of sense in Hebrew of the odd word χοιρογρύλλιος, which the LXX. have used instead of λαγώς, which happened to be the name of Ptolemæus Soter's father; the word *tzeerath* appears to have been added to complete the sense. It may be observed that the Talmudists do not seem to know the difference between transcription and translation, and speak as if the changes were made in the Hebrew. The above is from the Talmud Babli; in the Talmud Yerushalmi the number of differences is reduced to thirteen. According to it, *arnebeth* was the name of Ptolemy's mother.

Along with the Jews there was a considerable body of Samaritans in Alexandria, who continued bitterly opposed to those who were so close to them, who had the same sacred books, and worshipped the same God with the same rites. There are references by Origen to a *Samariticon* which seems to mean a version of their recension of the Torah in Greek. It has been maintained that there was no Greek version of the Samaritan Hebrew, but that the Greek quotations referred to the *Samariticon* are merely transla-

tions of the differences of this Hebrew from the received text. It seems hardly probable that the Samaritans would remain without having in Greek the Law according to their recension. Moreover Origen, had it been the Hebrew, would have transliterated, at least occasionally. In the work of Abul-Fatḥ, the Samaritan annalist, there is an account of the translation of the Torah into Greek. Tolmai (Ptolemy) sent to the Samaritan High Priest, as well as to the Jewish, and got scholars both from Samaria and from Jerusalem to render the Law into Greek. The two bands were lodged in separate quarters, and when their work was completed, each party presented the result to the king. According to the Samaritan annalist, Ptolemy declared the Samaritan version to be the superior.[1]

It is well known that in a very considerable number of instances the Septuagint agrees with the Samaritan against the Massoretic. When attention is directed to these alone, by a natural psychological law, these differences from the Massoretic and resemblances to the Samaritan bulk more largely in the eye than they have any legitimate claim to do. It is overlooked that these cases are balanced by the more numerous cases in which the Samaritan agrees with the Massoretic against the Septuagint. There are also cases in which the LXX. and the Massoretic agree against the Samaritan; there is still another set of cases in which all three differ from each other. As a consequence of this, all

[1] The present writer received from the Samaritan High Priest another account. While the Jews sent seventy-two translators the Samaritans sent five, each of whom made an independent translation; they all agreed, not verbally (he did not claim that), but in meaning they did so; moreover that all five copies were preserved with them in Nablus. Not to seem incredulous, I declared these would be immensely valuable, and asked if they had showed them to any scholar. "Yes," he said, "they had been shown to Dr Merx." My answer was that if Dr Merx had seen them, every scholar in Europe and America would have known about them in three months, and in six, examination papers would be set upon them. To this he returned no answer—only smiled benignly at me through his beard and remained silent. Although the latter portion of the High Priest's statement is palpably untrue, there yet seems a likelihood that the first part of it represented one form of the Samaritan tradition.

the theories that have been devised to explain the relationship of the Samaritan and the LXX. which take into account only the instances in which they agree against the Massoretic are insufficient. Another point is that these theorists, largely Jews, fail to remember a fact already dwelt on—the comparative recency of the Massoretic text; this tends to limit their views and vitiate their conclusions.

A study of the Massoretic text reveals not a few phenomena which tend to lower very considerably its critical value. The fact that the written text is a slavishly accurate copy of a blundering manuscript which by some chance gained a certain amount of interest, does not make for respect of the critical methods of the editors who adopted it, though they corrected from at least one other MS. When it is remembered that the Massoretic text received its final form some eight hundred years after that used by the LXX., and approximately a millennium after the date of Nehemiah, when according to a majority of critics, Manasseh conveyed to the northern portion of Palestine what became the Samaritan Recension, the relative value of the Massoretic becomes very considerably lowered. When study reveals the eminently unscientific methods of the Massoretes, it would seem to be an assumption in the highest degree hazardous to take it as representing the genuine text of the Torah. The Palestinian text of 280 B.C. must have differed considerably from that even of the days of Origen.

There is an uncertainty on the other side as to the precise text of the Septuagint. Our earliest manuscripts, if a few papyrus fragments are excepted, date from the fourth and fifth Christian centuries; that is to say, manuscripts that have passed through the transcriptions of five or six centuries. In imitation of the Jewish Rabbin, Christian scholars have, in relation to the Greek of the Old Testament, been in the habit of perpetuating one text, that of the Vatican Codex, removing only the more obvious blunders. The text of the Codex Alexandrinus exhibits many differences from that of the Vatican. We must also take into account the changes introduced by editors. It is not known what method Lucian pursued in his recension of the Septuagint text as only fragments of its results have been preserved.

More, however, is known of the methods followed by Origen. Unfortunately he appears to have regarded the Hebrew text of the Old Testament which he found in Palestine as correct, and consequently he was always liable to alter the Greek so as to conform it to the Hebrew of Palestine. Hence our present text of the Septuagint is in closer agreement with the Palestinian text, which immediately preceded the Massoretic, than was the original. Thus, on the side of the Greek as well as of the Hebrew, the question of the relationship of the Septuagint to the Massoretic text is involved in uncertainty. Whatever the point of time from which the existence of the Samaritan text as distinct from the Judaic began, its true history is quite unknown. Holding as we do that the original Samaritan text is to be dated in the time of Ahab at latest, we have nevertheless to admit a drastic revision of it. Presumably with the arrival of Manasseh, as we have already suggested, to give the New Temple the sanction of scriptural authority, there was the insertion of the passages in Exodus and Deuteronomy in which Mount Gerizim is designated as the place in which there was to be erected the stone on which the Law was to be inscribed. Probably also then it was that the future in Deut. xii. 5, 14, 26, etc., was changed into the preterite, so that it should no longer be "the place which the LORD thy God *shall* choose to put His name there" but "the place which the LORD thy God *hath* chosen." It may also have been then that the ages of the antediluvian patriarchs were adjusted to Samaritan ideas of fitness, and the genealogical table of the descendants of Noah made symmetrical with that of those who lived before the Flood. The *Textus Receptus* of the Samaritan Pentateuch, which is taken for granted in most discussions of the questions involved, is that of Walton's Polyglot. It seems to have been printed from one manuscript, and that a very defective one. In the main it agrees with the MS. numbered by Kennicott 183 (designated G by v. Gall), but occasionally Walton inserts a blunder which 183 avoids. In these circumstances any absolute conclusions from it are impossible. If, however, the comparison, in regard to the Septuagint on the one side, is to cases where the Alexandrine text

agrees with the Vatican, and on the other where the Samaritan text is well supported by diplomatic authority, conclusions may be arrived at of at least probable accuracy.[1]

In studying and estimating the differences between the Septuagint and the Massoretic text on the one side, and those between either and the Samaritan on the other, the first thing that strikes the reader is that a large number of the differences between the two Hebrew texts cannot be transferred to the Greek. As has been already observed elsewhere, the great majority of the differences between the Massoretic and the Samaritan are due to the insertion or non-insertion of *vav* and *yodh*, that is to say, due to the use in one but not in the other of two different, but equally correct modes of spelling. It is for instance quite as correct to write אורות as אורת, or for that matter אורות or אורת. These variations cannot be rendered in Greek, the words are the same whether they are written with the vowels *plene* or not. In regard to such variants the statement of Ginsburg has to be borne in mind. Quoting from Jehudah Chayney ibn Ezra, he says, "It is perfectly certain that the presence or absence of the *ahevi* letters is entirely due to the idiosyncrasy of the scribes" (Introd., p. 137). Many other variants are due to the fact that the fem. 3rd pers. pron. is by the Massoretic generally written the same as the masculine, whereas in the Samaritan the distinction of gender is maintained. As has been already shown, this is in all likelihood due to a blunder of the scribe to whom we owe the *k'thibh* of the Massoretic text. That difference can as little be represented in the Greek. On the other hand, while in ordinary cases of translation the order of the words of a sentence in the original can rarely be more than guessed, anyone reading the Pentateuch in the Greek of the LXX. will not fail to observe how closely the order of the Hebrew words is followed to the neglect of the normal Greek order. The general Hebrew order is to begin the sentence with the verb, then take the subject, and last the object; whereas in the Greek, as in English, the general rule is to place the

[1] On account of the war and the consequent impossibility of getting books from Germany, I have only been able to make use of von Gall's edition in regard to Genesis (1917).

verb about the middle of the sentence, with the nominative first and the object last. Observation will show the reader that the great mass of the sentences in the Septuagint Pentateuch begin with the verb, except where, as in Gen. iv. 1 and vi. 8 (9), the subject is placed first in the Hebrew. The only cases in which the Hebrew order is not followed are where, for an indication of emphasis, the subject is placed at the beginning. In this way the order of the words of a sentence, which is sometimes different in the two recensions, may show the agreement of the Greek with one rather than the other.

By writers on the Samaritan question, as has been hinted above, the resemblance between the Samaritan and the Septuagint has been greatly exaggerated, and limiting considerations have been overlooked. If the problem were simply to account for resemblances between the Samaritan and the LXX. against the Massoretic, and if there were no disturbing instances in which one of the two agreed with the Massoretic against the other, or where all three were different, the discussion of the question would be very much simplified. For one thing, the theories possible would be reduced to three: either (1) the Samaritan originated by retranslation from the LXX.; (2) or the LXX. was a translation from the Samaritan; or (3) both the Samaritan and the LXX. were drawn from a common source, which differed from the Massoretic. There might be, besides, the theories which regard the resemblances as secondary phenomena; that the Samaritan was modified from the LXX., or the LXX. from the Samaritan. The first three are regarded by Kohn as all that are possible.

The first of these theories, *i.e.*, that the Samaritan originated by retranslation from the LXX., is attributed to Frankel, though scarcely quite accurately. Whoever was its author, the theory is an impossible one. Had there been any excuse for it, the Jews would certainly have reproached the "Cuthæans" with drawing their Torah from the *Yavanim;* yet among the many contemptuous statements made by the Jews of "the foolish people who dwell in Shechem," this is not one of them. Irrespective of the numerous cases in which the differences between the Samaritan and the

Massoretic are of a nature which cannot have been translated from the Greek, there are cases in which the Septuagint agrees with the Massoretic against the Samaritan. Thus in Gen. xvii. 17; while the Massoretic has the verb יָלַד in the Niphal, so that the sentence reads "Shall a son be born to one who is a hundred years old," the Samaritan has the Hiphil so that it read, "Shall I who am a hundred years old beget a son?" In this case the LXX. supports the Massoretic against the Samaritan. Another instance is Gen. xix. 12 in which the Massoretic has, in regard to the Divine messengers who had come to destroy Sodom, אֲנָשִׁים *'anashim*, "men," while the Samaritan has מַלְאָכִים *mal'achim*, "angels": in this case also the Septuagint follows the Massoretic in preference to the Samaritan. There are, further, instances in which the Samaritan and the Massoretic are agreed against the Septuagint. There is an instance of this in the 16th verse of the chapter before us, Gen. xix.; here the LXX. has ἄγγελοι, whereas the Massoretic and the Samaritan have אֲנָשִׁים *'anashim*.[1]

There is an element of something like absurdity in this hypothesis, as in a comparatively short period after the Law was translated into Greek in Alexandria, that language became commonly known, the *lingua franca*, in the dominions of the Diadochi; consequently to translate any work from Greek into Hebrew was needless.

Another hypothesis referred to by Gesenius (*De Pentateuchi Samaritani Indole, etc.*, p. 13) and Kohn (*De Pentateucho Samaritano*, p. 29) and credited by them to a certain Rabbi Asaria de Rossi, a Mantuan Jew of the sixteenth century, is that the Alexandrian Greeks, moved by hatred of the Jews, corrupted the version of the LXX., and so changed the sacred Torah. Only Jews, a people thrown in upon themselves by their ritual separation from other peoples, could have been vain enough to think that they or their Law, barbarians as they were in the eyes of the Hellenic peoples, would be important enough for the Greeks to attempt to adulterate it; or that, whatever their hatred of the Jews, they

[1] Blayney has *'anashim* apparently supported by all his MSS.; von Gall does not give *malachim* among his various readings.

should take such an indirect way to injure them. Moreover, it implies no very high esteem for the Jews of Alexandria that they would suffer any Gentile to insert interpolations into their Law. Had any one, Greek or Egyptian, determined to introduce false elements into the Greek version of the Jewish Law, he would have done this to a greater extent and to more purpose than merely to introduce the unimportant variations from the Massoretic to be found in the Septuagint, and derived from it in the Samaritan.

A modification of the two hypotheses just mentioned is held by Frankel, who supposes that the Samaritans interpolated passages into their recension of the Law from the Septuagint. It is difficult to understand what motive would induce them to make these interpolations. As has been pointed out by Kohn, this hypothesis does not serve much, as there are many difficulties in the relation between the two left unsolved. The treatment of the genealogies of the patriarchs, for instance, is very different in the Samaritan and in the LXX. All the differences between the Massoretic and the Samaritan connected with the consecration of Mount Gerizim are, of course, left untouched.

The converse of these above hypotheses, which all assume the dependence direct or indirect of the Samaritan Recension on the Septuagint, Dr Kohn with all the emphasis of extended type maintains in his inaugural dissertation. These are his words (p. 36): "The Samaritan Codex, although a false (*mendosa*), manufactured (*emendata*), interpolated (*adulterata*) edition of the Jewish Codex, is nevertheless the foundation of the Alexandrine version." He thinks that the Septuagint, as we have it, does not accurately represent the version in its original form. Had the Greek text been preserved in its primitive form, it would have been found to be further removed from the Massoretic and nearer the Samaritan. In agreement with an opinion which has been hinted at earlier in the present chapter, he holds that the efforts of Origen to bring the Greek of the Septuagint into closer conformity with the Palestinian Hebrew, and with the other Greek versions which had been constructed with a view to represent more accurately the Hebrew, have largely changed its character. He maintains that Lucian

and Hesychius continued the process. Other scholars have regretted the work of Origen and his successors, as destroying the authenticity of the Septuagint by conforming it to the then Palestinian Hebrew text. Kohn further thinks that the Alexandrine text as printed by Grabe more nearly represents the genuine Septuagint than does the ordinary Vatican text. His hypothesis as stated by himself is "that the LXX. version of the Pentateuch is not a first hand (*primitivam*) genuine production, but that it has been concocted (*confecta*) in accordance with some Græco-Samaritan version" (p. 38): or as he puts it otherwise, "The LXX. translators in translating made use of a Samaritan Greek version." The history of this Samaritan version, according to him, was of this sort. There was a large community of Samaritans in Egypt, and especially in Alexandria, who quickly adopted the manners and language of the Greeks, but still did not wholly abandon their religion. For their use a translation was made from their recension of the Law. When they had for their own needs made this translation, the Jews who were staying alongside of them, and began to feel the same need as they, were willing to make use of their version, as their religion and that of the Samaritans was the same. This they did for some time, till they observed that it had in it many blunders; they then determined to have a translation of their own. They had, however, been so accustomed to the Samaritan version that it influenced their translators in making one for themselves. It was thus only an emended edition of the Samaritan that resulted.

There are, however, several difficulties in way of adopting this hypothetical history. It is known that the Jewish community in Egypt, and above all the Alexandrian, was very large and influential; but we have no reference to a Samaritan community at all commensurate with that of the Jews, nor any notice that they sooner, than the Jews, hellenised. There is further the chronological difficulty; there is not time before the date of the translation of the Septuagint, and after the founding of Alexandria, for the Samaritans to become so hellenised as to need a translation of the Law, and thereafter for the Jews to have become

so habituated to it that they were unable to escape its influence in translating for their co-religionists. This hypothesis is quite at variance with every Jewish tradition, whether preserved in Josephus or the Talmud. It has, moreover, no support from any record of Samaritan tradition. Such a fact as that the Jews had to depend on them for their Greek version of the Torah would not readily have disappeared from Samaritan memory.

Some of the evidence Kohn adduces in favour of his view might be used to support a totally different thesis—namely—not that the LXX. was translated from the Samaritan Recension, but that the translators used a manuscript written in Samaritan characters. He deduces that the LXX. had before them a Samaritan MS. because they read (Exod. xiv. 2) for הַחִירֹת *ha-Ḥiroth*, "the caverns," הַחֲצֵרֹת *ha-Ḥatzeroth*, "the courtyards," being led into the blunder by the resemblance between *yodh* and *tzade* in the Samaritan script. As the Samaritan text has not this reading, this is, so far from being an evidence in favour of his thesis, rather against it. Further, the resemblance between these letters is not so great in the form which these letters assume in MSS. as in the Samaritan alphabet devised for the Polyglots. Yet once more, as ἔπαυλις, the word in the Septuagint is a translation, not a transliteration, of the name in question, which is Egyptian (the presence of the Egyptian definite article *pi* is evidence of this); any deduction from it as to the precise form of the word in the Hebrew text is highly hazardous. The meaning of the Egyptian word intended is very doubtful. It is extremely difficult to identify accurately a word in one language from the transliteration of it in another. But even the Greek word presents difficulties. The Greek term is in the singular, but the Hebrew which Kohn suggests is plural. Sayce thinks that the "dwelling," ἔπαυλις, in question was a country house of Pharaoh, and he maintains that the Pharaoh had such a country house at Thukot (Succoth). With so much of dubiety, the evidence for a various reading of the sort Dr Kohn asserts is scarcely demonstrative. He brings forward another instance of mistake due to resemblance

of Samaritan characters; Θασοβαν is the transliteration of אֶצְבֹן Ezbon (Gen. xlvi. 16). This he regards as due to the resemblance between *aleph* and *tau*, in the Samaritan script. This, however, only proves what is otherwise not unlikely, that the Hebrew manuscripts used by the translators were written in Samaritan characters. The inscriptions on the coins of Simon the Maccabee are in a script closely akin to the Samaritan epigraphic script. Further, the Samaritan text here has אצבעון *'Etsb'aon;* the inserted ע *ain* would certainly have left its trace as it has in אֶלְעָזָר Ελεαζάρ, Eleazar, and in בִּלְעָם βαλαάμ, Balaam. If this example proves on the one hand that the translators of the Septuagint used a manuscript in Samaritan character, it also shows that it was not an exemplar of the Samaritan Recension.

The third hypothesis of those classified by Dr Kohn: That the LXX. and the Samaritan were drawn from one vitiate source need not detain us long. This hypothesis might explain the phenomena if these embraced only differences of the two in common from the Massoretic. It is not so good an explanation when it is discovered that very frequently, as mentioned earlier, one of the two agrees with the Massoretic against the other. Not infrequently, all three differ.

It would seem that the only possible hypothesis which will meet all the difficulties is that all three recensions—the Samaritan, the text behind the Septuagint, and the Massoretic—are independent offshoots from one original, the oldest of these being the Samaritan, and by far the most recent the Massoretic. If chronology were the only thing to be taken into account, the probability would be that the Massoretic had diverged furthest from the original. The evidences, however, of exceptional care and conservatism may to a considerable extent modify this conclusion. When the state of the Egyptian Hebrew MSS. of the other books of Scripture is considered, a suspicion is thrown even on the books of the Law, although it would doubtless receive exceptional treatment. Consequently, the MSS. behind the Septuagint may have varied more than the others. The

number of blunders of which the Samaritan scribes have been guilty, especially as compared with the accuracy with which the Massoretes have perpetuated even blunders, is significant —though some Samaritan MSS. have been carefully executed. Taking all things into consideration, the Samaritan text may be regarded on the whole as the best, the Massoretic next, and last the LXX.

In order to investigate the matter independently and form an estimate of the relationship between the LXX., the Samaritan, and the Massoretic, probably the simplest method will be to take a couple of consecutive chapters in Genesis. As those with which most people are best acquainted, the chapters that first suggest themselves are the opening chapters of the book. Gen. i. 9, after the phrase וַיְהִי־כֵן "and it was so," the LXX. inserts "and the water which was under heaven was collected into its meeting-places and the dry land appeared." This addition is found neither in the Samaritan nor the Massoretic. In Grabe's edition there is the marginal sign which shows that it was not in the Palestinian Hebrew in Origen's day. After the words "and it was so" the addition is pleonastic; but if those words were omitted, it would be quite in the Oriental manner to repeat, after the command, its fulfilment. In verse 14, the Samaritan and the LXX. insert "to give light upon the earth"; in some MSS. of the LXX. there is the further addition, in which it has the support of the Armenian, Ethiopic, and the Palestinian Aramaic translations from the LXX. "To rule the day and the night." This last phrase is neither in the Samaritan nor in the Massoretic. The majority of the remaining cases of variation between the Massoretic and the Samaritan in chapter i. are such as do not show in translation. The first variant in chapter ii. is in verse 2, "sixth" instead of "seventh"; in this the Samaritan and the LXX. are agreed against the Massoretic. Chapter ii. 4 reads in the LXX., "This is the book of the generation of the heaven and earth," whereas the Massoretic and Samaritan have "These are the generations of the heavens and the earth." In verse 12, the Samaritan adds after "gold" the word "exceedingly," which is found neither in the LXX. nor

in the Massoretic. The 19th verse reads in the Samaritan and the LXX., "The LORD God further created from the ground every beast of the field"; the Massoretic does not insert "further." In verse 24 there is a case in which there is a quotation in the New Testament (Matt. xix. 5; Mark x. 8) which follows the LXX. and the Samaritan inserting "twain," reading against the Massoretic "and they *twain* shall be one flesh."

When the results are summed up, it is seen that in four cases the Samaritan Recension agrees with the Septuagint against the Massoretic; in three cases the Samaritan and the Massoretic are agreed against the LXX.; and one case in which the LXX. and the Massoretic agree against the Samaritan. It is to be observed that the instances in which the Septuagint stands alone involve greater differences than when either of the other two stand alone, with the exception of ii. 2, in which the Massoretic alone has "seventh." There is here no proof of any one of those recensions being dependent upon either of the other. In these two chapters there is every possible combination of two against one, an evidence of complete inter-independence.

In order that the induction should not have too narrow premises, the above method may be applied to the first twelve verses of chapter x., which is made up largely of proper names. In verse 2 the LXX. inserts Ελισα between Ιωναν and Θοβελ against the Samaritan and the Massoretic; however, the Samaritan and LXX. agree against the Massoretic in reading מוסוך Μοσόχ instead of מֶסֶךְ. In verse 3 the Samaritan has ריפר[1] against the Massoretic רִיפַת which is in this case supported by the LXX.; in verse 4 by dropping ה in Elishah the Samaritan stands alone; the Massoretic is in opposition to the Samaritan and the LXX., in reading דֹּדָנִים against רֹדָנִים of the Samaritan and Ῥόδιον of the LXX. This is one of the few instances in which Gesenius thinks the Samaritan reading to be the better. In verse 5 the LXX. stands alone in having "land" instead of "lands." In verse 6 the LXX. alone reads *Mesrain* and *Phoud* instead of

[1] This is according to Walton's text; von Gall does not give it among his various readings.

Mitzraim and *Phut;* the first of these variants may be regarded as due to the resemblance between *mem* and *nun* in the earliest form of angular. In verse 8 the LXX. in reading "Nebrod" instead of "Nimrod" merely gives evidence of a defective pronunciation on the part of the translator who dictated the version. In verse 8 by rendering ἐγέννησε the LXX. supports the Samaritan הוליד against the Massoretic יָלַד; the LXX. inserts "God" after "LORD" in opposition to the Samaritan and Massoretic. In verse 12 the LXX. by confusing *daleth* and *resh* and *mem* and *nun* reads *Dasem* instead of *Resen.* This affords evidence that the MS. used by the LXX. had in its ancestry a MS. written in the angular script. In these twelve verses, there are five cases in which the LXX. stands alone against the Samaritan and the Massoretic; three in which the Massoretic stands alone; two in which the Samaritan is opposed to the LXX. and the Massoretic. In these verses also there is therefore no evidence of any special connection between the LXX. and the Samaritan. There does seem to be proof that while the actual manuscript from which the Pentateuch was translated had been written in the Samaritan script it was not a Samaritan MS. but one that had a different descent. One thing to be noted is that in very few cases have the confusions of letters which have occasioned the variants been traceable to the Egypto-Aramaic script of the Assouan papyri. Not improbably synagogue rolls of the Law would be written in the Samaritan script, and these, being the ancient Hebrew writing, might be regarded as sacred, much as the Jews at present, who, though they write the synagogue rolls in the square character, write their letters in a much more cursive script.

The decision just arrived at, that there is no special relationship between the Samaritan and the LXX., is confirmed by a study of the more striking differences between the Massoretic and the Samaritan. In the antediluvian genealogies all three recensions differ. No one has ventured to assert that the LXX. copied its version of the ages of the pre-diluvial patriarchs from the Samaritan. Nevertheless, Dr Kohn says "that in almost every case (*paene semper*)

where the two Hebrew recensions differ the Septuagint agrees with the Samaritan." He does not discuss this notable exception, a fact all the more remarkable from the chronological differences involved. He grants that the additions which refer to Mount Gerizim have not been admitted into the Septuagint, but explains this by saying that these errors had been observed, and formed the occasion for the revision of the Greek translation. There could, however, have been no principle involved to prevent the Egypto-Hellenic translators from inserting the summation of the ages of the patriarchs that immediately followed the Flood. Yet although this summation is found in the Samaritan it is not transferred to the LXX.

Dr Kohn devotes several pages to further proof of his thesis. He brings example after example in which the LXX. agrees with the Samaritan, and from this would argue the dependence of the former on the latter. He does not even consider the possibility that all three recensions—the Massoretic, the Samaritan, and the Hebrew behind the Septuagint—spring from a common source. As above noted he, like most Jews, is so blinded by national prejudice that he regards it as an axiomatic truth that the Massoretic text must always be assumed to be correct. Such a prejudice as this renders him practically incapable of coming to a correct conclusion on the question at all. What is meant will be best seen by an example. In Gen. xlix. 6, Jacob, in speaking of Simeon and Levi, says, "O my soul, come not thou into their council; unto their assembly my glory be not thou united" (R.V.). The Samaritan of the last clause might be rendered "In their assembly let not my liver become hot."[1] If the insertion of *vav* be neglected, the differences are two; by the change of *daleth* into *resh* the verb translated "joined" becomes "grows hot." Further, the verb in the Massoretic is in the feminine, although כָּבֹד is masculine. The meaning of the figure, on either rendering, is not very clear; the word translated "honour" may as well be rendered "liver"; the "liver" to the Hebrew had much the same meaning which we attach to "heart." The idea suggested

[1] Gesenius would render *kabhôd*, "liver," in Ps. xvi. 9; lvii. 9 (E.V. 8); cviii. 2 (E.V. 1).

by the Samaritan is of a person getting excited in an assembly of heated persons. This is as intelligible as the Massoretic reading; so the blunder may as well be on the one side as the other. The LXX. certainly takes *kabhôd* to mean "liver" (the meaning which appears to suit best with the rest of the clause in the Samaritan), but with regard to the critical verb *tehad* or *yaḥor* it would seem by the introduction of *sustasis* as if the LXX. followed the reading of the Massoretic. The evidence in this case is scarcely convincing that the LXX. followed the Samaritan.

Another instance brought forward by Dr Kohn is, as it seems to us, inappropriate. It is said in Exod. xiii. 18, "And the children of Israel went harnessed" (armed, R.V.) חֲמֻשִׁים *ḥamushîm;* the Samaritan scribe wrote חֲמִישִׁים *ḥamîshîm*, which may either mean "by fifties" or "in the fifth generation," which latter is the meaning the LXX. has preferred. In general, when there is difference between the two recensions of *vav* in the one and *yodh* in the other, the blunder has been made by the Jewish scribe copying from a MS. in the early square character. Hence it is probable that the Samaritan text, which agrees with the Septuagint, is correct. It was promised to Abraham (Gen. xv. 16) that "in the fourth generation" his seed should return to Palestine from the land of bondage; a prophecy that would be fulfilled, if, while the great majority of the mature members of the nation were of the fifth generation, a considerable number of the generation preceding still survived. Even among ourselves, cousins-german may be separated from each other in age by more than half a century. According to the chronology of the Samaritan Recension and of the Septuagint, the residence of the children of Israel in Egypt was 215 years.[1] Whether or not the reading of the Samaritan Recension is correct, there is no proof that the reading of the LXX. was derived from it. A manuscript in the Maccabæan script would distinguish too clearly between *vav* and *yodh* for a scribe to confuse them.

[1] In Gen. xv. 13, the stay of Israel in Egypt is put at 400 years, an estimate that certainly does not harmonise on our chronology with "the fourth generation." Possibly the generation was reckoned by the extreme limits of individual life, in which case the century might

What Dr Kohn calls "a wonderful example of how badly the Greek interpreters understood the Samaritan Codex" is found in Num. xxi. 30, which is rendered by the English Versions, "We have shot at them; Heshbon is perished even unto Dibon, and we have laid them waste even unto Nophah, which reacheth unto Medeba." It may be observed in passing, that with regard to the first clause, the Samaritan and the Massoretic are agreed practically, save that the Massoretic by dropping the ה *he* at the end of *'abadh*, has made Heshbon, contrary to Hebrew usage, masculine. In the latter clause the differences are that the Samaritan reads *esh*, "fire," instead of *asher*, "which," and על *'al*, "upon," instead of עד *adh*, "to." The rendering of the LXX. is very different from either. "And their seed shall perish from Esebon unto Daibon; and their women have yet kindled a fire against Moab." While it is true that the word translated "we have shot at them" is identical, consonantally, with a word which would mean "their lamp," and it is also true that in regard to David, and David alone it is used four times (1 Kings, xi. 36, xv. 4; 2 Kings viii. 19; 2 Chron. xxi. 7) in a sense which indirectly means "progeny," we doubt if this be the true occasion of the LXX. rendering. We would venture to hazard another explanation. In the script of the Assouan papyri *nun* is not unlike *zain*, and *yodh* is like *ain;* the reader, when a manuscript, ancestor of that used for the translation into Greek, was being transcribed, unable to understand the rare word before him, resolved it into *zar'am*, "their seed." The Samaritan Targum derives the word in question from *rûm*, "to lift up," and renders "we have lifted up to destroy Heshbon unto Dibon." Dr Kohn assuming without any evidence that the Samaritan reads *venashim*, "and women," instead of *vannashim*, "we laid waste," holds that the LXX. followed it. As neither text was vowelled

be reckoned to a generation. It has been asserted, on what evidence we know not, that the earliest Babylonian year was reckoned from solstice to solstice, consequently every year consisted of approximately six lunations. The 400 years of Abraham's vision would then roughly coincide with the period of their stay according to the chronology of the Samaritan and the LXX. It may be noted that in this hypothesis the ages of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob would cease to be abnormal.

in those days, the LXX. reader would have been liable to make the blunder, if blunder it be, as much from the Massoretic as from the Samaritan. The more important variation of "Moab" for "Medeba" calls for explanation. In the script of the papyri, *yodh* and *daleth*, written carelessly might coalesce into a form not unlike *aleph*. The *'asher 'adh* of the Massoretic is a blunder; the *qri* marks the *resh* doubtful, and the *daleth* of *'adh* differs from *lamed* by the thin line rising from it, which often disappears in MSS.; and thus, if the word was originally *'al*, it becomes *'adh*. So far from this example proving the dependence of the LXX. on the Samaritan, all it does prove is that the MS. from which it was translated had in its ancestry a manuscript written in the characters found in the Assouan papyri, and therefore from a source independent of both the Massoretic and Samaritan.

Several of the instances that follow in Dr Kohn's list, however interesting they may be in relation to the genesis of the LXX. rendering, have no bearing upon the relation of the Samaritan to it, as the Greek may as readily have been translated from the one as from the other. Sometimes the evidence he brings would prove too much and therefore proves nothing. In Deut. xxvii. 26, Dr Kohn argues that the LXX. has translated from the Samaritan because the latter inserts *kol*, "all," before *dibrĕ hat-Torah*, and the former renders *πᾶσι τοῖς λόγοις*. By parity of reasoning, it would follow that the English Authorised was also translated from the Samaritan: "Cursed be he who confirmeth not all the words of this law to do them." Luther translates *Verflucht sei, wer nicht alle Woerte dieses Gesetzes erfuellet;* therefore his version also must have been translated from the Samaritan.

The instance in Deut. xxxii. 35 involves more elements than Dr Kohn adverts to. It is rendered in the Authorised, "To me belongeth vengeance and recompense." The Samaritan has instead of לִי *li*, "mine," לְיוֹם *lyom*, "to the day"; this clause is made dependent on בָּנוּם *kanûs* (v. 34), "to collect,"[1] the Divine wrath is laid up in store

[1] As כָּמַוּם *kamûs*, the word in the Massoretic, occurs only in this passage it is probably to be regarded as a blunder, due to the likeness of *mem* and *nun* in the angular.

"to the day of vengeance and recompense." The probability that the Massoretic is at fault is confirmed by the fact that the LXX. while it agrees with the Samaritan in reading *lyom* differs from it by reading אֲשַׁלֵּם *ashallēm* instead of שְׁלֵם *shillēm;* the verb "I will repay" instead of the noun "recompense." In the epigraphic script of the Samaritan *vav* and *aleph* are somewhat like. This supports the thesis maintained above, that the LXX., though translated from a manuscript written in Samaritan, or what is practically the same thing, Maccabæan characters, was not translated from an exemplar of the Samaritan Recension.

Among the instances which Dr Kohn advances, there are some in which the Massoretic has omitted, by *homoioteleuton*, a clause or portion of a clause. An example of this is found in Deut. xiii. 6; which, speaking of temptations to idolatry, commands that even the nearest and dearest should be slain, if they should endeavour to tempt them to worship other gods; the verse begins: "If thy brother, the son of thy mother, or thy son, etc.," so it stands in the Massoretic. There is a want of completeness in this, for it would seem to imply that solicitations to idolatry, when offered by a paternal half-brother, would not be guilty or punishable actions. The Samaritan and the LXX. avoid this: "If there tempt thee thy brother, the son of thy father or the son of thy mother, etc.," the enclitic pronoun being the same, and the *b* sound and the *m* sound being so closely cognate that the scribe who wrote to dictation might readily miss the former of the two terms. The blunder must have been an ancient one, as it is found in the Peshitta, not to speak of Jerome. It is, however, needless to follow Dr Kohn through all his examples, none of which really proves any dependence of the LXX. on the Samaritan Recension. While one or two of them render it almost certain that the translation was made from a manuscript in Samaritan script, they at the same time, by the differences they exhibit, show that, as said above, this MS. was not an exemplar of the Samaritan Recension.

One passage, Exod. xviii. 6, 7, is worth being looked into because of certain peculiarities. It almost seems as if Dr Kohn had forgot that his thesis was to prove the depend-

ence of the LXX. on the Samaritan, because this instance might be cited as evidence of the converse, of its complete independence. Jethro had come to meet Moses and to bring to him the wife who it appears had deserted him when he went back to Egypt. Verse 6: "And he said unto Moses, I, thy father-in-law Jethro, have come unto thee, and thy wife and her two sons with her." Verse 7: "And Moses went to meet his father-in-law, and did obeisance, and kissed him, etc.," yet in the previous verse Jethro had already talked with him. Jerome avoids the difficulty by a paraphrase. The difficulty is really due to the introduction of אני *ani*, "I," instead of הִנֵּה *hinneh*, "behold," as in the Samaritan, which therefore might be rendered "One said to Moses, Behold, thy father-in-law Jethro has come," etc.[1] The LXX. appears to have had לֵאמֹר *lēmor*, "to say." In verse 7 the LXX. follows the Massoretic exactly and omits the phrase לְמֹשֶׁה *l'Moshe*, "to Moses," found in the Samaritan; an addition which saves the dignity of Moses by saying that Jethro did obeisance to his son-in-law. This would prove that the Alexandrian translators had their own text, which sometimes agreed with the Massoretic and sometimes with the Samaritan.

As an indirect method of throwing light on the question of the relation in which the Septuagint stands to the Samaritan Recension, it will be advantageous to consider the peculiarities of the Alexandrian version. It has been seen above that many of the differences between the LXX. and the Massoretic, and also between it and the Samaritan, have been due to mistakes of hearing, consequently that it is nearly certain that the translation was written to dictation —one man reading the Hebrew while another translated as he wrote. There seems to have been a tradition which implied something of this sort. In contradistinction to the account given by Irenæus, according to which each one of the seventy-two translators occupied a separate cell, Epiphanius tells that they were distributed in thirty-six cells, two in each, an arrangement which would suit a method of translating such as has been indicated above.

[1] This is the rendering of the Peshitta.

The effect of mistakes of hearing will naturally be more observable in the transliteration of proper names, than in cases of real translation. In considering this, the fact that there are peculiarities of two languages to be taken into account complicates the problem; not only has the pronunciation of Hebrew to be considered but also that of Greek. As, however, the pronunciation of a language is perpetually changing, the mode of pronouncing given letters at a given time must, where it can be ascertained, be thought of. It has already been noted that the Samaritans pronounced no gutturals; the question will accordingly present itself: Are there any traces of mistakes attributable to this fact to be seen in the LXX.? It is evident that the person, whose office it was to read the Hebrew, did pronounce some of the gutturals. In regard to the letter ע *ain*, it seems certain that two sounds were expressed by one sign. In Arabic there are two sounds of the letter, one little more than a catch in the breath, the other a burred *r*, such as one hears in Northumberland. This latter is distinguished from the character for *ain* by being dotted, and is called *ghain*. One phenomenon which strikes anyone who studies the transliteration of Hebrew names into Greek, is the apparently capricious way in which *ain* is represented sometimes by no consonant at all, sometimes by γ *gamma*. It is necessary at this point to consider the pronunciation of the Greek *gamma*. The Greek priests in Palestine at the present time pronounce that letter precisely like the Arabic *ghain*. There are two names which, as written in Hebrew, begin with the same syllable עֲמָלֵק and עֲמֹרָה the one is transliterated by the LXX. Αμαλεκ (Amalek) and the other Γομορρα (Gomorrah), which as adopted by Jerome have been passed on to us. Another example is specially worthy of note, as the modern Arabic name represents the distinction above mentioned. The southmost of the Philistine cities is in Hebrew עַזָּה transliterated Γαζα (Gaza) in Greek, but in Arabic the opening letter is *ghain*, and so pronounced. These differences have usually been preserved by Jerome; there are, however, exceptions to this. The daughter of Jezebel, wife of Jehoram of Judah, in Hebrew עֲתַלְיָה becomes

Γοθολια (Gotholia) in Greek, but Jerome writes the name Athalia, a fact that indicates a change in the pronunciation. When the letter in question occurs in the middle of a word there is the same variety in transliteration, thus בִּלְעָם becomes in Greek Βαλααμ (Balaam); but Chedorlaomer in Hebrew כְּדָרְלָעֹמֶר is Greek Χοδολλογομὸρ (Chodollogomor); in the Vulgate this appears as Chodorlahomor, from which our English has been modified, following Luther. Another example may be taken from the names of these four kings; Tidal תדעל, which the LXX. mistaking ר for ד have rendered Θαργαλ (Thargal), Jerome Thadal, Luther more accurately Thedeal. The strongest guttural ח *ḥeth* is normally represented by X as חֶבְרוֹן becomes Χεβρων and חת Χετ. Very frequently, *ḥeth* is represented by the soft breathing; there seems to have been no regulating principle employed. A similar want of law or principle is observable in our own language in regard to the silence or pronunciation of *h* in words derived from Latin through French; we have "habit," "herald," "hautbois," in which *h* is pronounced, and "heir," "hour," "honour," in which it is not, yet they all equally have Latin roots and come to us through the French. A similar usage seems to have sprung up in Egypt with regard to the pronunciation of Hebrew. With regard to ה *he*, it is frequently represented by the rough breathing, as Ἁγαρ for הגר Hagar and Ὁδορρὰς for הדרם Hadoram. From the above it is clear that the Septuagint was not translated by one who read Hebrew as the Samaritans did, dropping all the gutturals.

Another peculiarity of the Samaritans was that, like the French and Germans, they could not pronounce *th*, but the LXX. translator had no difficulty about Togarmah which they wrote Θογαρμα, *Thogarma*, so also with Tarshish which becomes Θαρσεις, *Tharsis*. So we find Θαργαλ, *Thargal*. Thus all evidence points to the fact that the reader for the Alexandrian translator did not labour under the disabilities as to pronunciation which affected the Samaritans. There is therefore little likelihood that the Septuagint was merely edited from a Samaritan version, or that the manuscripts employed by the LXX. represented the Samaritan Recension.

There are cases, as has already been observed, in which both the Samaritan and the LXX. differ from the Massoretic but do not agree with each other. The amount of difference sometimes varies in extent, being greater in one than in the other. The most important instances of this are the genealogies in Gen. v. and xi., to which a passing reference has already been made. Even a casual consideration of the genealogy of the antediluvian patriarchs reveals that there must be a principle at the back of the variations. In discussing the relation of the Samaritan Recension to that of the Massoretes, it was suggested that there was the idea that there must have been a progressive shortening of human life from Adam downwards. Each son dies at an earlier age than his father. Enoch and Noah are exceptional persons, as of each it is said that he "walked with God"; if they are excepted, in the Samaritan genealogy, then the only other exception to this is that Cainan has a longer life than Enos by five years. The difference from the Massoretic extends only to three of the patriarchs—Jared, Methuselah, and Lamech.

In the genealogy, as it appears in the LXX., there are evidences of a principle at work differing from that which influenced the Samaritan scribes. The peculiarity of the Septuagint version of the antediluvian genealogy is that a hundred years is added to the age of each of the first five patriarchs before the birth of his eldest son. The motive for this change may well have been apologetic. The length of life ascribed to those who lived before the Flood might easily be a stumbling-block to those living among the critical and philosophic Greeks, who would be ready enough to ridicule anything that emanated from barbarian sources. An answer readily suggesting itself would be that though the age was reckoned in "years," these years were really only "months." This hypothesis was all the easier to the Alexandrian Israelites, since the Hebrew word for "year" שָׁנָה *shana*, really meant "repetition." The repetition which would be earliest recognised, after the succession of day and night, would be that of the phases of the moon. Those who had little or no knowledge of artificial light would be much more dependent on the light of the moon than we naturally imagine. Moreover, in Egypt and South-

Western Asia, moonlight has a splendour rarely seen in our more cloudy atmosphere. This might easily lead to reckoning by moons; these, however, would be felt to be cumbrous from their number, so they were grouped, sometimes in tens, as in Rome, sometimes in twelves, as in Babylon. At this point, a greater repetition was discovered, the succession of the seasons. A study of the stars revealed the fact that the constellations had a succession of times in which one after another of them dominated the midnight sky. The phenomenon of solstice would be observed. The agricultural stage, when reached, would lead to the succession of the seasons of seedtime and harvest being emphasized; and the fact that twelve moons so nearly coincided with the revolution of the heavens would lead to that being adopted. The answer to the supposition that the "years" in the patriarchal ages were only "months" was open to one difficulty on the received Massoretic text. If the age of the patriarchs at the birth of their eldest sons is divided by twelve the resultant age is in many cases too young for paternity. Leaving out Adam, since presumably he was created full-grown, Seth was at the age of 105 a father. This number, if divided by twelve, gives an age of eight years and nine months. The ages of these antediluvians when their eldest son is born is a diminishing quantity, till in regard to Mahalaleel it is recorded that he was sixty-five years at the birth of Jared; on the mode of calculation above adopted he would only be five years and five months old. If, however, a hundred months are added, that is to say, eight years and four months, the age becomes no longer an impossible one, at least, in the precocious East.

In the genealogy of the post-diluvian patriarchs who preceded Abraham, the LXX. is in closer agreement with the Samaritan than in regard to the antediluvians; both add a century to the age of the patriarch as given in the Massoretic before the birth of his eldest son; this is the case in regard to all those before Serug, and including him. Although there is this agreement in the ages before Nahor, there are yet differences enough to prove independence. The LXX. adds to the life of the elder Nahor before he becomes a father a century beyond his age, as given in the Massoretic. More-

over, the LXX. inserts Cainan between Arphaxad and Sala (Shelah). It is, however, in the latter portion of the lives of these patriarchs that the greatest difference appears; only in one case do the LXX. and the Samaritan coincide in regard to this; in both, Eber lives 270 years after the birth of Peleg. In the Samaritan, there is on the whole a continuance of the shortening of life which had characterised the antediluvian genealogy. Another point of difference is that the LXX. gives no summation of the years of the life of these post-diluvian patriarchs as the Samaritan does. It seems obvious that the two recensions are quite independent the one of the other.

The limitation which Dr Kohn sets to his theory of the dependence of the LXX. on the Samaritan ought to be remembered. He maintains that the Jews corrected the more obvious errors of the Samaritano-Greek version, but the smaller and obscurer variants were not observed. In the case, however, of these genealogies the Jewish revisers of his hypothesis do observe and do alter; they do not, however, endeavour to bring the Greek they are to use henceforward into conformity with the Massoretic, but introduce an independent set of variants. If the Jewish scribes did not retain the reduplications in the account of the plagues of Egypt to be found in the Samaritan, they made, or found in their MSS., various additions not to be found either in the Samaritan or the Massoretic. When a catalogue of the descendants of Jacob at the time they went down to Egypt is given (Gen. xlvi. 20) after the sentence which occurs alike in the Massoretic and the Samaritan, "And unto Joseph were born in the land of Egypt, Manasseh and Ephraim, whom Asenath the daughter of Potipherah the priest of On bore to him," the LXX. adds, "And there were sons born to Manasseh, whom his Syrian concubine bore to him, Machir, and Machir begat Galaad. And the sons of Ephraim the brother of Manasseh, Soutalaam and Taam, and the sons of Soutalaam, Edom." There is nothing of all this in the Samaritan. To some extent, the information may have been got from 1 Chron. vii. 14-19, but the passage there is very confused, as it appears in the rendering of the LXX., "The sons of Manasseh; Esriel, whom his Syrian concubine bore, and

she bore also Machir the father of Galaad"; then follows the account of other sons. It is to be observed that in the addition before us there is no word of "Esriel" (Ashriel). The portion of the verse about Ephraim suggests the same source, but the passage here is further from the Hebrew of the Massoretic as it is reflected in the Greek of Chronicles. Instead of the numerous sons attributed to him in 1 Chron. vii. 20-27, there are only two, and their names are difficult to identify with any of those in 1 Chron. vii. By somewhat of a stretch *Soutalaam* may be recognised as intended to represent Shuthelah; as for *Taam*, it is very difficult to imagine it as an attempt to transliterate Tahath. The Greek in Chronicles is much closer to the Hebrew, writing *Sothalath* and *Thaath*. It would almost seem as if the names had been written down memoriter on the margin of some early copy, and had slipped into the text. One thing is clear; the names have not been taken from the Hebrew direct, but have been written down from a confused memory of the Greek of Chronicles.

Further, in the later chapters of Exodus, according to the Septuagint, there are changes in the position of the sections when compared with the Massoretic which have no support in the Samaritan. A great portion of the 39th chapter according to the Massoretic and Samaritan occurs in the 36th of the LXX.; the rendering is by no means so close as in other parts of the Pentateuch; the breast-plate is called *logeion*, "the Oracle," which is rather an explanation of the use made of the Urim and Thummim which were placed in it than a translation of the word *hoshen*. Chapter xxxvii. of the LXX. agrees in the main with chapter xxxvi. of the Massoretic and the Samaritan, beginning at verse 9: chapter xxxvii. (LXX.) agrees in the main with xxxvii. of the Massoretic and Samaritan. The opening verses (1-10) of chapter xxxix. (LXX.) coincide with xxxviii. 24-30 (Massoretic and Samaritan). With xxxix. 42 (Massoretic and Samaritan), agrees xxxix. 11 (LXX.), but two verses are added which do not represent anything in the Hebrew of either recension: "The rest of the gold which remained of the offering, they made into vessels for ministering in them before the LORD; and the blue that was left, and

the purple and the scarlet, they made into ministering (*leitourikas*) garments for Aaron, in order that he might minister in them in the holy place."

While in the above instances of dislocation, the Massoretic and the Samaritan are agreed against the LXX., there are cases in which the Massoretic and the LXX. agree against the Samaritan. The ten verses which describe the altar of incense are placed in the Samaritan Recension between the 35th and 36th verses of chapter xxvi. of the Massoretic, whereas the Massoretic and the LXX. place them at the beginning of chapter xxx.

All this confirms the decision to which we have already come, that the Septuagint was not translated from a manuscript which was an exemplar of the Samaritan Recension. On the other hand, the differences from the extant Massoretic Recension are too many and too important to render it at all probable that MSS. from Jerusalem were those from which the translation was made. It may be urged that as the Massoretic did not reach its present form till the fourth or fifth century A.D., the text then in use in Palestine would be older than the Massoretic by six or seven hundred years, so that it might differ very much from what it had been in the days even of Ptolemy Philometer. Still, the rate of change, as measured by what is to be observed between that behind Aquila and the Massoretic, is so slow, that the difference from the text of Aquila and Symmachus and that from which the Septuagint was translated need not have been very great. That the Samaritan differs from the Massoretic so much less than the LXX. is confirmatory of this. From these grounds we are led to assume that the LXX. was translated from MSS. already in Egypt, which probably had a long Egyptian descent.

Can anything be discovered as to the character of those manuscripts? It is a matter of some importance to find out so far as may be possible the character and age of the MSS. used by the "Seventy," whoever they were, when translating from the Hebrew. From the number of instances in which, as shown by Dr Kohn, differences of the Greek from the Hebrew can be explained by mistakes due to resemblances of letters in the Samaritan script, it may be assumed that

the MSS. immediately used by the Greek translators were written in Samaritan, or what is the same thing, Maccabæan characters. This, however, is a very different matter from saying that they were exemplars of the Samaritan Recension. The Jews certainly did not write in the square character in the days of the Lagid supremacy. The coins of Simon the Maccabee more than a century later had their inscriptions in a script analogous to that of Samaria. As the object of the superscription was to inform the public of the value of the coins in question, it would be in the style of writing ordinarily in use. If the translation was made in the days of Philadelphus (approximately 280 B.C.), nearly a century and a half before Simon first struck coins, the MSS. used would be written in a similar script. Fully a century before Philadelphus was the inscription cut on the sarcophagus of Ashmunazar. The script on this last, though distinctly angular, yet approximates to that on the Maccabæan coins. Hence the script of even Jerusalem MSS. would be very like that of the Samaritan codices to which Dr Kohn refers. The differences are, as already stated, too great for one to hold that the LXX. has been translated from Palestinian MSS., and as there is no evidence that they were Samaritan—indeed the evidence is distinctly hostile to that view—we are forced to maintain that the translation was made from a manuscript, or from manuscripts, already in Egypt which had been copied from Egyptian codices. This is confirmed by evidence which appears to prove that the manuscript used had in its ancestry one written in the script of the Assouan papyri. Further, there are traces in the Septuagint of the influence of the earlier angular script to be found on the Siloam inscription. This would suggest that the ultimate ancestor of the Egyptian MSS. was brought down into Egypt by Jeremiah, at all events by some one about his date. The number of exiles that were carried down into Egypt, by Johanan the son of Kareah, along with Jeremiah, must have been very considerable. They must have had the Law and known its contents, as Jeremiah rebukes them for not obeying it (Jer. xliv. 23). If that is so, there is evidence of the totality of the Law long before the mission of Ezra.

If the script of the Assouan papyri was that in use in Egypt, how is it that the characters confused belong to the Samaritan or Maccabæan script? The answer to this can be found in the present habits of the Jews; copies of the Torah, engrossed for use in the synagogue, are written in square character, whereas in the private letters, though written in Hebrew, the script is totally different. The Assouan papyri are copies of letters and deeds. From the Talmud (*Sanh.* 21 *b*) we learn that the script of Samaria was regarded as that in which the Law had been given at first, and therefore it might well be reckoned sacred. Before there were regular synagogues, the Torah might be copied, like other documents, in the script of Assouan; hence the confusions traceable to it, although the synagogue rolls would always be written in Samaritan script—or to give it its Talmudic name—Ibri character.

If the differences between the Samaritan and the Massoretic suggest a common source dating from a more or less remote antiquity, it might be argued that the greater the differences the greater the antiquity of the common source. Then, as the differences of the LXX. from the Massoretic are so much greater than the differences of the Samaritan, it might be argued that the Septuagint is older than the Samaritan; that is to say, moved away from the common source at a much earlier period. Whether or not there is any truth behind the Talmudic legend of a statutory copy which was regarded as the model to which all copies of the Torah must conform, the chances of accuracy were greater in Palestine than in Egypt. The knowledge of Hebrew even among the Jews resident in Egypt would not be that of Jews in Palestine or Samaritans who always retained Hebrew alongside of Aramaic. Moreover, the knowledge of the Law was much more diffused in Palestine than in Egypt, consequently the possibility of blunders was limited both in extent and degree. From this it follows that the copying of Hebrew documents would not be so carefully done in Egypt. Further, in translating, even if the translators were Jews, they would not have the knowledge due to what may be called customary knowledge to guide them. Consequently in a given time the variants in the

Egypto-Hebrew manuscripts would be greater than in Palestinian ones, whether in Judea or in Samaria.

To sum up the result of the present investigation into the relation between the Samaritan Recension and the Septuagint; it is clear that the one is no mere repetition of the other; they are independent witnesses, alike testifying to the integrity of the Law (or, to give it the Greek name so generally used, the Pentateuch) from a period long before the advent of Ezra in Jerusalem.

CHAPTER XII

THE BEARING OF THE FOREGOING ARGUMENT ON PENTATEUCHAL CRITICISM

As will doubtless have been guessed by the reader all that has preceded has been intended to lead up to certain conclusions which have a bearing on the criticism of the Pentateuch. In order that the force of the argument should be apprehended, it will be well to sum up seriatim the various points involved and discussed. In the first place it has been shown that the claim of the Samaritans to be Israelites is well founded. From the ordinary methods of the Assyrians, and from the express statements of the inscriptions of Sargon, it is clear that only a small portion of the people were deported. Their home so closely contiguous to Judea places their knowledge of Israelite ritual beyond dispute. The minute points in which the Talmudists find fault with those whom they call "the foolish people who dwell in Shechem" is evidence of the general accuracy of their ritual. In the next place, a study of the history of the Samaritans evidences the faithfulness with which they held to the worship of JHWH despite the most savage persecutions inflicted on them by Jews, Romans, Byzantines, and Moslems. It has been further seen that their Mosaism, their ritual of worship in accordance with the Mosaic Law, did not begin under the Persian rule, but stretched away back to times before the fall of the Northern Kingdom. The evidence of the prophets is clear on this point. Yet again, the apparent antagonism between the worship of JHWH in the Northern Kingdom and that on Mount Zion has to be explained. The source of the difference is shown to be connected with the influence of the prophets and of prophetism. As the Samaritans

claim to have maintained their original ritual of worship from the times of Eleazar the son of Aaron to the present day, it is necessary to study their acts of worship and their ceremonial rites. As the religion of Israel, like Christianity, rests upon history the views entertained as to sacred history have to be ascertained. Religion expresses itself not only in ritual but in forms of thought, that is to say, a theology emerges. Consideration of Samaritan theology shows it to consist of doctrines practically identical with those of Judaism but attained by a different route. As bearing on the age of the Samaritan Recension, it is needful that the evidence of age afforded by the Samaritan script be carefully considered. It was seen that certain symptoms pointed to the mother roll, from which originally the Recension took its rise, having been written in the script of the Siloam inscription if not earlier. The peculiarities of the Samaritan pronunciation of the Hebrew have a chronological bearing and must not be omitted from consideration. The form Aramaic assumed when spoken and written by the Samaritans has a bearing on the questions at issue, and also their literature and the poetic form the Samaritans affected. As the question of the relation of the Samaritan Recension to the received Massoretic text is of the highest importance for criticism, there has been a careful examination of the resemblances and differences between them. It has been long recognised that there are many and striking cases in which the Samaritan Recension resembles the LXX.; that also has been compared.

After the foregoing recapitulation, the results of the study may be more concisely summed up. The feature most prominent is the independence of the Samaritans as regards the Jews—an independence that assumed the form at times of meaningless antagonism; an independence which was maintained although Judaism surrounded them on every side, not only to the south in Judea, but to the north in Galilee, and to the east across Jordan. Their stern faithfulness to the ritual and creed of the religion received from their fathers, renders the idea of change of faith foreign to them. When the ritual of the Samaritans is compared with that of the Jews, while the essential identity is patent,

there are many minor differences, and all these are on the side of greater simplicity, and therefore of greater primitiveness. This characteristic is specially obvious in regard to the most essential rites of the religion of Israel, Circumcision and the Passover. In regard to the latter the primitive character is naturally more obvious. Although it is in some respects difficult to discover the exact way in which the Jews of the century before the destruction of the Temple celebrated the Passover, yet much can be gathered from Josephus and the New Testament; the evidence of the Talmud is not quite valueless although it is late. One very marked difference is that while the Jews, in the period before the destruction of the Temple, when they could still celebrate the Passover, kept the feast within doors; the Samaritans celebrate it out of doors on the top of Mount Gerizim. Certainly the Jewish method is more like the account given in Exod. xii., whereas the Samaritans appear to have perpetuated the modifications which the ordinance would have to undergo in the wilderness, when the house was a tent and there were neither lintels nor door-posts (Num. ix. 5; see also Josh. v. 10). The pit oven in which the lambs are roasted among the Samaritans points to the habits of a village community, or the encampment of Bedu in circumstances in which they had to be careful of fuel. This mode of roasting, as is proved by their monuments, was practised neither by the Egyptians nor by the Assyrians. The Samaritan mode of celebration has the look of being a survival of the time before the central shrine was adopted by the Israelites. The view they have of sacred history is certainly a late travesty of the truth. It however evidences the necessity the Samaritans felt to have their faith based like that of the Jews and Christians on history of some sort. Yet this must be said that the Samaritan travesty is not any wider from the truth of fact than are the stories to be found in the Talmud. As to doctrine, the mutual reproaches which Jews and Samaritans cast at each other, and the erroneous accounts which they give of each other's faith, are convincing evidence that neither borrowed from the other, to any great extent. The Samaritan angelology is a ca- in which this is obvious; the names given to the angel

by the Samaritans differ from the Jewish names; indeed are constructed on a different principle.

Another aspect of the questions involved emerges with the consideration of the Samaritan script. The Talmud, as has already been shown, acknowledged the Samaritan script —the characters of the Samaritan alphabet—as being more ancient than the square character used by the Jews; indeed, they seem to have regarded the script of Samaria as that in which the Law was first given. This confirms the contention that the Samaritan aspect of the religion of Israel was not dependent on Judaism, and in not a few features it is the more primitive. The aspect of independence is exhibited from another side by the form which Aramaic, the *lingua franca* of South-Western Asia, assumed in their lips; it is much more Hebraistic than is Jewish Aramaic—a symptom that seems to indicate that the Samaritans spoke Hebrew longer than did the Jews, and were less exposed to foreign influences. The poetry of the Samaritans has features like that of the Jews, but what is regarded as the essential characteristic of Jewish versification — parallelism — they do not use; they indulge very largely in acrostics involving the whole alphabet, a poetic form of which the Jews made occasional use; rhyme, of which the Jews have no indubitable examples, at least in the classic period of the Hebrew language, is a very favourite mode with the Samaritans.

More important is the relation in which the Samaritan Pentateuch stands to the Massoretic Recension. We have seen that many of the differences between the two recensions are due to blunders of the Jewish scribes; while others are due to mistakes on one side or other in consequence of resemblances of letters, as has been observed in an earlier chapter, in a script like that of the Siloam inscription, or even an earlier. A comparison of the Samaritan Recension with the Septuagint shows that though the translation was made from a manuscript written in Samaritan characters, it was not made from an exemplar of the Samaritan Recension. There further seemed to have been manuscripts written in the angular script, with at least one in the script of Elephantine.

One point is clear from all this: when the Samaritans got the Torah it was complete in all its parts; if it is a compilation, then the compilers had completed their work. All the proofs alleged by critics that the Pentateuch is made up of different documents are to be found in the Samaritan, as much as in the Massoretic. It is certainly the case that the Samaritan has, in a few instances, JHWH, when the Massoretic has Elohim, and *vice versâ*, but these are not frequent enough to affect the issue seriously. The same thing may be said of the Septuagint, although the variants from the Massoretic are more numerous and important. In these circumstances it is all-important to fix the date at which the religious separation between the Jews and the Samaritans took place. This is all the more important that it will fix the latest date at which the alleged editing can have taken place.

Before entering on the critical theory of the constitution and origin of the Pentateuch, or—to give the collection of documents in question the name most in favour with the followers of Wellhausen and Kuenen—the Hexateuch, it might be well to endeavour to realise how things would appear to one untrammelled by previously formed opinions. That the book in question was to be separated into superincumbent strata, the lines of stratification running through the whole six subsidiary portions, would never occur to him. After a perusal more or less careful he would be inclined to regard the first book and the fifth as differing from those three books that come in between. As decidedly he would put the sixth book in a separate category. In regard to Genesis, presuming the investigator here imagined to have put to the one side all the claim it makes to be a record of God's revelation of Himself to man, he would find it composed mainly of legendary stories. These narratives are connected chiefly with the lives of four successive individuals, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and Joseph. The stories are simple and naïve; even when the scene is transferred to Egypt, we seem to be sitting at a tent-door hearing tales of his ancestors told by a hoary bearded sheikh in the clear moonlight of the East. The three books which follow are legal and ceremonial. They form a unity;

there is a historical preamble, and historical episodes, but there is not much of the purely legendary; with all their contents these three books form one law-book. Were it not for the formula in which JHWH is declared to be the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, which occurs about a dozen times in those books, mainly in the beginning of Exodus, and a casual reference to Joseph in the first chapter of Exodus, and a notice of the removal of his bones in the thirteenth, these books might be regarded as totally independent of Genesis, the literary atmosphere is so perfectly different. The frequently recurrent phrase of Genesis "the generations of" practically disappears in the ceremonial books. Another phrase takes its place, and occurs with greater frequency, "The LORD spake unto Moses saying." When the reader we have imagined proceeds to Deuteronomy, he again is conscious of a change of atmosphere. The whole book has the semblance of having been spoken by one man, by Moses on the Plains of Moab; it is a recapitulation of the history and legislation of the three preceding books with alterations. In its literary form Deuteronomy agrees with not a few specimens of Egyptian and Assyrian literature. Indeed the structure of the book from a purely literary point of view strongly resembles that of the Memoirs of Sunhit; it, like Deuteronomy, begins with a designation of the author and concludes the opening paragraph with the word "saith." In regard to the sixth book, the student we have presupposed would be conscious of yet another change of atmosphere. It certainly implies the books which have preceded, but it is widely different in style.

Though JHWH promises to be with Joshua as He was with Moses, there is a distinct difference in the attitude. The phrase so common in the Law book, *vyedabber JHWH el Moshe lemor*, practically disappears; it is found only once. Joshua does not enjoy the frequent intercourse with JHWH that Moses did. While Moses is frequently referred to, it is by a new designation, "Moses the servant of JHWH." Another thing our investigator would not fail to observe would be the disappearance of the archaisms frequent in the preceding five books. All these resemblances and differences would seem to preclude the

hypothesis of lines of stratification running through all the six books.

This last named hypothesis is that, notwithstanding, which has been adopted by the most influential school of Biblical critics at the present time. This theory of parallel documents was suggested, with much diffidence and after much hesitation, by Astruc, a French physician of the eighteenth century. While he had observed the stratification mainly in Genesis, and pointed it out there, from dogmatic reasons he carried it on into the opening chapters of Exodus. His hypothesis was that Moses had before him two documents or sets of documents, the one characterised by the use of the Divine Name JHWH, the other by the use of Elohim, and that from these he made extracts, which he introduced without change into his own narrative. This peculiarly Eastern method of literary procedure was not unknown among classic writers; Diodorus Siculus has extracted long passages from Polybius and other writers without acknowledgment or alteration. Eichhorn, writing about half a century later, recognised this stratification as extending through all the books of the Pentateuch. Stähelin and de Wette saw these documents in the book of Joshua also. It was found by later students that matters would be simplified critically if it were recognised that there was not merely one but that there were two Elohists; the one annalistic like the Jehovist, the other drier in style and interested more in ritual than in legends. This second Elohist was designated P, and his work was described as the "Priestly Code"; the symbol of the Jehovist became J, and of the Elohist E. By some scholars it was felt that certain chapters in the "Priestly Code" suggested another hand; these were segregated under the title of "The Law of Holiness," and were designated by the letter H. Keener sighted critics saw the hand of members of the Deuteronomist school expanding statements; as the writer of Deuteronomy was represented by the letter D so those followers of his were also symbolised by the same letter, only distinguished from him by an added numeral. Later critics distinguished later hands among the priestly writers, so there are P_2 and P_3. There were also discovered to be second and third Elohists

and second and third Jehovists. Such in rough is the history of the origin and evolution of the critical theory of the structure of the Hexateuch.

Having narrated the origin and development of the ruling critical theory, it is needful to consider it as a completed whole. Succinctly stated, it is the hypothetical history of the origin and evolution of the Five Books of Moses and the book of Joshua; or, as it is called, the Hexateuch. In considering the relation of the Samaritan Recension of the Torah to the critical discussions, the extent assigned to it is the first question to be settled. It is an essential part of the critical theory that it is a Hexateuch, and that Joshua is an integral part of it. It is beyond denial that the Samaritans never since the days of Sanballat have had the canonical book of Joshua. The settling of this question is to a great extent independent of the Wellhausen hypothesis. Astruc never could have thought of his theory had he begun his study with Joshua. By Bennett (Polychrome Bible, "Joshua") the first two verses of the first chapter of that book are ascribed to the Elohist, yet the Divine Name introduced is JHWH, and it appears twice. In fact very rarely in the whole book does Elohim make its appearance, except as an attributive after JHWH.

Above, in a previous chapter, a reason has been suggested why, with all the motives the Samaritans had for holding Joshua in high honour, they yet had not the book which related his exploits. Traditions of him remained, and he was spoken of as "King Joshua." It is clear then that if the Samaritans got the Law through the fugitive priest Manasseh, whether he fled to Samaria in the days of Artaxerxes Longimanus, or a hundred years later in the days of Alexander the Great, "Joshua" was not regarded at that time as part of the Law. Manasseh had no reason to withhold it, and the Samaritans had every reason to wish for its possession. As has elsewhere been pointed out, Joshua was the great hero of the Northern tribes: legends had gathered round him, and his tomb was with them.

It admits neither of doubt nor denial that the Jews put the book of Joshua on a different plane from that on which they placed the "Five Fifths of the Law," and a much lower

one. It is regarded as a palmary argument against the authenticity, and consequent historicity, of the book of Daniel, that the Rabbin of the third or fourth century excluded it from the "Prophets" and relegated it to the *K'thubhim:* yet the far earlier decision of the Jewish teachers, that "Joshua" is quite separate from the Law and is to be reckoned among the Prophets, is overridden without scruple.[1] The critical reason assigned for this exclusion is that there is nothing in "Joshua" bearing on conduct. If this were the principle which governed the inclusion of matters in the Law, or exclusion from it, then Genesis ought to have been excluded as well as Joshua; this argument proves too much, therefore proves nothing. But it is not strictly true. The treaty which Joshua is related to have made with the Gibeonites is expected to regulate the conduct of the Israelites in regard to these Gibeonites in the days of Saul and David. Again, the territories to be occupied by the different tribes were arranged by Joshua; this had an abiding effect on the conduct of the Israelites of later days. The story of Naboth and his vineyard shows the sanctity with which the pious Israelite endowed the inheritance he had received from his fathers, and his relation to it. Its want of relation to conduct cannot be the reason for the exclusion of "Joshua" from the Torah. One further reason is suggested, a literary one, why "Joshua" should be considered part of the Law despite its exclusion from it by the Jews. The Pentateuchal history stops at a very awkward point; Israel is encamped in the Plains of Moab, preparing to cross the Jordan, and it needs the book of Joshua to

[1] The case against "Daniel" is peculiarly weak, its exclusion from the Prophetic books is so very late. It is among the "Prophets" in the Canon of Alexandria. Our Lord quotes Daniel as a prophet (Matt. xxiv. 15; Mark xiii. 14). Josephus includes "Daniel" among the "Prophets," since the four books of the *K'thubhim* described by him cannot fit "Daniel" (*contra Apionem*, i. 8); moreover, he distinctly calls him a prophet (*Ant.* X. xi 7). In the Canon of Melito, which by its exclusion of the Apocryphal books of the Alexandrian Canon shows its Jewish origin, "Daniel" is reckoned among the Prophets (Euseb., *Eccl. Hist.*, iv. 26); his date is *circa* A.D. 180. The earliest notice of Daniel not being among the Prophets is in Jerome's preface to Daniel written about two hundred years after Melito.

complete it. This is no argument, else the fact that Thucydides ends his history in the middle of a sentence would be proof that he wrote also the *Hellenika* which continues the history and begins "After these things." This much at all events is clear, that not only must the exclusion of "Joshua" from the Law have been effected before the flight of Manasseh to Samaria, but so long before that the fact of its previous inclusion had disappeared from memory, consequently long before the advent in Jerusalem of Ezra, who by hypothesis brought the Law.

We have already considered the evolution of the ruling critical theory, it is now necessary to describe the evolution of the Pentateuch according to it. Somewhere about the time when Jehoshaphat was reigning in Jerusalem, a Judæan began to collect the legends of the origins of the Israelite race. About a century later, an Ephraimite, when the Northern Kingdom was tottering to its fall, if it had not already fallen, commenced making a similar collection. The Southern writer preferred to speak of God by His Covenant name of JHWH, while the Northerner used the more general term, Elohim The Judæan document is designated by the letter J, the Ephraimite by E. Not quite a hundred years after the Northern Kingdom had fallen, during the reign of Josiah, a Redactor combined the two narratives, dovetailing one into the other.

These histories were prophetic in their origin, but in Jerusalem prophetic activity found another outlet. Under the zealous young king Josiah the Temple was undergoing repairs so thorough that they involved the masonry of the building. While these repairs were proceeding "the Book of the Law" was found, or was alleged to be found. Hilkiah the High Priest brought to Josiah the roll alleged to contain the Law. According to the critics this was its origin; certain members of the prophetic school, seeing the evils which resulted from the many High Places, composed this book. It professed to be written by Moses, his last words; so it gave Mosaic authority to the reform which it was desired to see instituted—a reform which would involve the destruction of all those local High Places. When it was written it was duly hid in the temple, with, it might be, the

connivance of Hilkiah, in a place where it might opportunely be found. As arranged it was found and produced the effect desired. This book so found is the book of Deuteronomy in the Pentateuch. The letter used to designate it is D. A later Redactor combined this Law book with the book which contained the narratives of J and E united, known as JE; he at the same time expanded the JE narratives and adjusted them to Deuteronomy. The Deuteronomist was followed by many of the same spirit who are credited with operating on the other books of Scripture, and inserting passages which do not suit criticism; these are denoted by D2 and D3.

Such was the position of things when Jerusalem was taken and Jeconiah and many of the inhabitants were carried into captivity. Among these captives was the prophet-priest Ezekiel. He was full of patriotic enthusiasm and eager to keep Israel pure and separate from the heathen. Moved by this desire, he and those influenced by him devised the "Law of Holiness." This as already mentioned is denoted by the letter H. In the "Law of Holiness" there is republished from Deuteronomy, with variations, the list of clean and unclean animals. The remainder of the book is mainly occupied with marriage relationships. Later the captive priests, guided it might be by remembrances of the temple worship, supplemented this "Law of Holiness" by an elaborate system of washings and sacrifices. The Law of Holiness thus supplemented became the Priestly Code. Meantime the combined document JE and D arrived from Jerusalem at Babylon. Whether after the book reached Babylon or before it left Jerusalem, later Jehovists had made additions and alterations; according to some, later Elohists also have left traces of their activities. We have thus to do with a J2 and a J3 and possibly an E2 and an E3 besides a relay of D's. The first chapter of Genesis is attributed to P, but the second chapter is assigned to J with additions by J2. The story of the Flood, with long passages attributed to P, is largely assigned to J2. Among the passages attributed to J2 are the opening verses of Gen. vii., in which there is reference to the purely Levitical distinction of animals clean and unclean; in the account of Noah's sacrifice with which the story of the Flood ends, also ascribed to J2, there is the

same distinction brought into prominence. To P are attributed most of the genealogies except those of Cain in Gen. iv., and those of Cush and Eber among the genealogies in chapter x. Such was the constitution of the Torah as it was brought to Palestine by Ezra, according to the Wellhausen theory. Even then it was not complete; thereafter additions were made to it; there are a series of priestly writers P2, P3, and so on.

With all its undeniable cleverness, this theory of the evolution of the Pentateuch inevitably suggests the cycles and epicycles of the Ptolemaic astronomy; as by the pre-Copernican astronomers, epicycle was imposed on epicycle, to explain aberrant phenomena, so by the critics are new authors supposed, in order by them to explain difficulties as they are realised. May it be thought disrespectful to the German professors and their followers to suggest that they might take an example from astronomers, who found a solution by abandoning their epicycles, and betaking themselves to simplicity by seeking for a new centre? Meantime a further hypothesis is needed to explain the non-existence of any trace of the Torah in its more primitive state before D or P had operated upon it. Of the Epistles of Ignatius we have not only the long Greek Recension but also the short Greek and the Syriac. In Egypt, as proved by the Assouan papyri, there were ancient Israelite communities; it may be that some shorter recension of the Torah may be found in the rubbish heaps left by their villages. The original recension of the Hebrew of the Egyptian book of Daniel must have been very different from the Palestinian text. However that may be, it is certain that when the Pentateuch reached Samaria it was complete in all its complexity of parts. The differences between the two recensions are slight, and can scarcely be said to involve any critical points. The sole point on which the Samaritan Recension can throw light is the date at which this compilation, if compilation it is, was completed.

It is an essential part of the critical hypothesis that Ezra brought the completed Law to Jerusalem. Since the Samaritan Recension contains, as has already been observed, all the constitutive elements of the Torah, J, E, D,

and P, with all the series of these letters followed by distinctive numerals, it follows of necessity, if this be so, that the Samaritans only received the Law after the last of these increments had been introduced into it. It is assumed that Manasseh, to give him the name by which Josephus designates the son-in-law of Sanballat, took with him, when he fled to his father-in-law, a copy of the completed Torah. It is not said that he did so either in Josephus or Nehemiah: still let it be assumed that he did so. Josephus says that he was the great-grandson of Eliashib, and brother of Jaddus or Jaddua the High Priest, who, according to Josephus, met Alexander the Great when he came to Jerusalem. Eliashib was an old man when Nehemiah came as Tirshatha to Jerusalem, as he had a grandson of age to be married. This grandson, as has been noted in an earlier chapter, Nehemiah chased from his presence because of his marriage; this occurred at latest in the year 433 B.C. Here we must ask permission to repeat a historical argument which we have given in a previous chapter in another connection. According to Josephus, Manasseh, a nephew of this man repeats his offence, something less than a century later, also with a daughter of Sanballat, and is banished by the Sanhedrin as was his uncle by Nehemiah. The unlikelihood of such an exact repetition of persons and punishments is elsewhere commented on. Another of his nephews is Jaddua, who, according to Josephus, was High Priest when Alexander the Great entered Palestine in the year 332 B.C. It is clear that Jaddua could not have been the contemporary of Alexander the Great unless Jonathan (called John by Josephus, and Johanan in Neh. xii. 22) was very much younger than the fugitive from Nehemiah; but this is highly improbable since the High Priesthood normally followed the line of primogeniture. Josephus is not the only authority for the meeting of Alexander with the Jewish High Priest; the Talmud (Yoma 69*a*) describes the meeting, but says that the High Priest was Simeon hatz-Tzaddiq, the grandson of Jaddua.[1]

[1] Both Josephus and the Talmud, the latter inferentially, declare Simon I. to be Simeon hatz-Tzaddiq; but critical opinion asserts that not he but his grandson Simon II. had the title; this grandson

That Simon I. was High Priest at the time of Alexander's invasion of Palestine is chronologically probable; the date of his grandfather's pontificate would probably be about 390 B.C., leaving forty years for the last years of the High Priesthood of Eliashib, and the High Priesthood of Joiada. He was succeeded by Onias I. the father of Simon (Simeon) I. Alexander was in Palestine in 332 B.C.

Josephus dismisses with a single sentence (*Ant.* XII. iv. 10) as a person of no account. The sole authority quoted for this identification by Cheyne, except a reference to the Talmud which is not decisive, is Derenbourg (*Hist. et Geog. de la Pal.*, p. 47). This latter asserts this identification and supports it by a passage from Yoma. Derenbourg declares that "nothing in the history of this pontif," Simon I., "or in the circumstances which surrounded him, either justifies or explains why this title 'the Just' should have been given to him. . . . Simon the Just lived in an extraordinary time when ancient institutions were crumbling, and when the gradual enfeeblement of religious sentiment in the priesthood was punished by visible signs of Divine displeasure." Then follows the quotation from Yoma 69*a*: "During the forty years of the pontificate of Simon the Just, on the Day of Atonement the lot for the goat destined for Jehovah always fell to the right hand; afterwards it was sometimes the right and sometimes the left. In his time the red thread which surrounded the head of the goat destined for Azazel became white, which indicated that the sins (of the people) had been pardoned; afterwards it sometimes became white, and sometimes did not. Under Simeon, the lamp lighted at the west of the temple shone always; after him it at times went out. While he lived, the wood once arranged upon the altar, the flame remained always strong and the priests had only to bring a few faggots of small wood to fulfil their duty; after him the flame often went down, the priests were busy the whole day carrying wood to the altar." I submit that all this proves precisely the opposite of what Derenbourg says it does. What the Talmudic writer evidently means to teach is that the period when Simon the Just was High Priest was one of strong faith and unswerving faithfulness, which was rewarded by numerous signs of Divine favour which ceased in the age which followed. Yet this is the passage which Cheyne quotes as proving his point. Dean Stanley (*Jewish Church*, iii. 247, note 4) says: "Derenbourg has conclusively established that the Simon of Ecclesiasticus was Simon II." If that is the critical idea of proof we shall not be surprised, should they direct their attention to the history of the Tudor period, that they would "establish" from Foxe's *Book of Martyrs* that Bishop Bonner was a kindly ecclesiastic with a leaning toward Protestantism. Yet it is something like an axiom of scientific (?) criticism that Simon II. is Simon the Just.

The evidence of Josephus is unreliable with regard to this period, because, as elsewhere noticed, he drops a whole century; misled by the confusing succession of kings who bore the names of Artaxerxes and Darius almost alternately, he seems to have concluded that there was only one Artaxerxes and only two Dariuses. The efforts he had to make to adjust historic facts to his shortened chronology have already been adverted to. The existence of the Sanballat contemporary of Nehemiah is confirmed by the Assouan papyri, in which the "sons of Sanballat" are referred to as the authorities in Samaria. If it was to the Sanballat of the reign of Artaxerxes Longimanus that Manasseh fled, then the Darius of whom permission was asked to build the temple on Mount Gerizim was not Darius Codomannus, as assumed by so many, but Darius Nothus, the son of Longimanus. The critics have accepted as correct the assertion of Josephus that Jaddua was the contemporary of Alexander. The authority of Josephus is accepted on this point without question, yet when he declares that Simon I. is Simon *ho dikaios*, it is without any value. In short, to "scientific" criticism Josephus, as an authority, is reliable or the reverse as it suits. While the legal dictum as to the testimony of a witness, *falsus in uno, falsus in omnibus*, would if pressed put out of court almost every witness as to any event in the more distant past, yet with a witness like Josephus one must try his testimony by probabilities, and consider whether his own reputation or that of Israel were involved on one side or other; whether, in short, he had any motive to depart from strict accuracy.

Let it be assumed that the son-in-law of Sanballat, who fled to Samaria, was the grandson of Eliashib whom Nehemiah drove from his presence, that it was for him that the temple was built on Mount Gerizim, and that he arranged the ritual of worship set up in it, presumably in accordance with that in Jerusalem to which he had been accustomed. Let it be further assumed that he took the completed Torah with him to Samaria and Shechem. Then on the acceptance of this hypothesis certain results follow. The Book of the Law, which Manasseh took with him

to Samaria, must have been that edited by Ezra. In that case, all the alleged post-Ezrahitic elements in the Priestly Code must be dated earlier than this flight; along with them, most of the activities of the Deuteronomic Redactor must also be antedated, as they are all in the Samaritan Pentateuch. The enmity between the two peoples, and the rivalry between the two shrines preclude the possibility of these additions and alterations being inserted later.

Even without these additions, sufficient difficulties emerge in regard to the Priestly Code as a whole, and its easy acceptance by the priests in Jerusalem, before it could be transferred bodily to Samaria. On the critical hypothesis, practically the whole of Leviticus was made known for the first time to the priesthood in Jerusalem by Ezra. For about a century they had been sacrificing on the altar set up by Zerubbabel on the site of the temple. For nearly three-quarters of a century, in the rebuilt temple, there had been maintained a regular ritual of sacrificial worship. Suddenly Ezra, a priestly scribe, arrives from Babylon with a new book of the Law. Priest though he is, he has never taken part in a sacrificial act, indeed has never in all his life seen a legitimate sacrifice offered. Yet this man comes to Jerusalem intending to revolutionise all the ritual that had been in use beyond the memory of the oldest inhabitants. Though it is true Ezra had behind him all the authority of the Great King, and was supported in every way by the local governor Nehemiah, still his success seems almost inconceivable. It needed all his own personal influence, backed by all the authority of the Tirshatha to carry into effect his interpretation of the marriage law. Important as this was, a change in the ritual of worship was a more serious matter. The Jews have always been specially conservative in regard to everything connected with the temple worship. When Aristobulus, the Hasmonæan High Priest, ventured to introduce some slight change in the ritual, he was pelted with citrons. Yet by hypothesis this extensive change in ritual was carried through without the slightest difficulty. It is true that the memory of those who had seen the temple services might be invoked in Babylon, but the last of them must have passed away long before

the days of Ezra. The elaboration of the sacrificial ritual as seen in Leviticus is far beyond the power of memory to carry over the half century during which there was neither temple nor sacrifice to keep the memory green and effective. The priests when they came to Jerusalem with Zerubbabel would elaborate a ritual for themselves; and this had already been hallowed by the experience of more than two generations when Ezra arrived. Ezra's success in the alterations which by hypothesis he introduced does not seem likely. One has only to read Josephus to see what slight matters, if the ritual of worship were involved, were sufficient to rouse the Jews against the power of Rome, a power much more tremendous than that of the Great King. This alleged overriding of the past by the single influence of Ezra is not to be explained by the reverence which the Jews gave to Rabbin and Doctors of the Law; for that was a thing of a much later day. So far is Ezra from occupying the pre-eminent place in the memory of the Jewish people, which necessarily he would have had if the Wellhausen critics are right, his name is not even included by ben Sira in his "Hymn of the Fathers." Surely if Ezra, like a second Moses, had brought to the Jerusalem Jews the laws of legitimate sacrifice, which though revealed to Moses their fathers had lost, his name would not have been forgotten when that of Zerubbabel and of Joshua the High Priest, nay that of Ezra's contemporary Nehemiah, are commemorated. For these historical reasons we venture to think that it is highly improbable that the Priestly Code is anything like so late as the time of Ezra.

Even should it be granted that despite all these improbabilities the priests in Jerusalem did submit to Ezra, and were willing to alter their modes of worship and their ritual of sacrifice at his bidding, yet the case of Manasseh and the ritual on Mount Gerizim presents further difficulties quite independent of those involved in the conservatism of the Jerusalem priests. By a rigorous interpretation of the newly promulgated law as to marriage, Manasseh is banished from Jerusalem by the influence of Ezra and Nehemiah. He would be little prone to inculcate in Samaria, whither he had retreated, the newly introduced precepts,

under which he had suffered the indignity of banishment. Surely not the most credulous critic would believe this to be at all likely. Would any one maintain the verisimilitude of a tale which represented a Puritan, who had suffered at the orders of Archbishop Laud fine and imprisonment, when he had made his escape to New England, eagerly setting about a propaganda in order to establish there a High Church Episcopacy with all the Laudian ritual?

Even if Manasseh had been so singularly constituted as to be willing to convey to Samaria the Ezrahitic Recension of the Law, another difficulty emerges on the other side: would the Samaritans have been willing to receive it? Even if the name "Samaritan" be restricted to the Assyrian colonists, yet even they could claim that for two centuries they had been worshippers of JHWH, taught by the priests who had been sent by Esarhaddon "the manner of the God of the land." If we are right in maintaining that the name had a wider application; that not merely were the colonists so called but also the Israelite majority of the population, then their worship would be carried back to a remoter past. In these circumstances, even the influence of Sanballat would have proved insufficient to have enabled Manasseh to carry out his reform. Would the Samaritans be at all likely to listen to a priest urging them to abandon a system of sacrificial ritual, which they had been taught by accredited priests, and to which they had become accustomed, and agree to adopt another from Jerusalem—one from which the man who taught it himself had fled?

If, on the other hand, Ezra had merely brought a copy of the Law which the Jews recognised as sacred, but had failed to observe with the strictness which Ezra demanded; if the sin-offerings, the peace-offerings, and the heave-offerings were all quite well known, but the ritual appropriate to each had not been quite rigorously attended to, and Ezra had directed attention to these shortcomings, in that case the matter becomes quite simple, and the submission of the people quite intelligible. This would be the case with regard to the Jews of Jerusalem. As to Samaria, if the worship on her High Places was essentially the same as that on Mount Zion, the adoption of that ritual in the newly

erected temple on Mount Gerizim, when national worship was concentrated there, would be perfectly natural. The influence of Josiah's reformation would make it all the easier, at least for the Israelite remnant who remembered, perhaps very vaguely, what their fathers had said of the worship on Mount Zion, to join in that on Mount Gerizim, if it retained the more prominent features of the old worship.

The picture of the state of matters in Jerusalem presented to us in Ezra and Nehemiah suits the conclusion to which we have come. There is no suggestion that the people are resisting or resenting the introduction of something new. On the other hand Ezra utters no word of blame to the people because of failure in the ritual of sacrifice, the thing he does blame is their non-Israelite marriages. The Feast of Tabernacles appears to have been neglected, but if Ezra originated the "Priestly Code" the feast was not introduced by him, as it forms part of the Deuteronomic legislation. Only as we may see when the reference to it occurs in Deuteronomy it seems to imply that the directions in Leviticus have preceded. However this may be, the adoption of the Levitical regulations by the Samaritans without difficulty or demur in their temple worship implies that the Priestly Code was known to them long before the coming of Ezra to Jerusalem.

The evidence afforded by the Samaritan Pentateuch of the relative age of the book of Deuteronomy has to be looked into. Reference has already been made to the marked difference of style and atmosphere which distinguishes the "Second Law" from the rest of the Torah. There is therefore a certain *a priori* plausibility in the critical hypothesis which assigns it a very different origin. The critical theory is that Deuteronomy is "the Book of the Law" found by Hilkiah in the temple during the repairs instituted by Josiah. If this is correct it is clear that the Samaritan Recension of the Pentateuch must be dated long after the coming of the priests sent by Esarhaddon as it contains Deuteronomy. But is there valid proof of its correctness? It is unfortunate for this hypothesis that the language of the narrative implies that the Law was well known to be written in a book, and Hilkiah had no difficulty

in recognising the book which he found, to be a copy of it. It is in some way an individualised copy, for he calls it "the Book of the Law." This recognition is all the more mysterious that by hypothesis, the Jews have, at this time, no law-book at all; J and E had been united in one "Book of Origins" but there was little of a legislative nature in it.[1] Had Hilkiah's message to the king been that they had found a book of Moses, his words would have been intelligible. It is true that Josiah reads the book as if it were a new thing in Israel; yet the depth of his repentance would seem to imply his belief that he and his people ought to have known those statutes, the transgression of which had involved them in such guilt, and had brought down upon them to such a degree the wrath of God. The sole evidence adduced that Deuteronomy was a pious fraud is, that the doctrine of that book required that only in Jerusalem could legitimate sacrifices be offered, and that this was acted on by Josiah alone, and by him only after the finding of the book. This assertion is not accurate on either side. Deuteronomy does

[1] The combined document JE could never have been recognised as a law-book. Imbedded in the mass of traditional narratives there is certainly the "Book of the Covenant," in all about three chapters (105 verses), preceded and succeeded by narrative. Moreover, though there is nothing impossible in the Southern prophetic schools collecting patriarchal legends, and those in the North following their example; and still less improbability, if after the fall of the Northern Kingdom, it became to a certain extent civilly, and still more religiously, joined to the Southern, a Redactor should arise who would combine the two collections: there is improbability in another direction. How did this collection ever get a Mosaic origin attributed to it? The separate collections would be perfectly well known, the dovetailing of these so as to form one narrative would also be public property. Before JE could be received as Mosaic some legend would have to be invented of its discovery in some secret place, in a jar filled with oil of cedar, like that in which Joshua, in the "Assumption of Moses," is ordered to conceal the revelation he had just been given from the lips of the great lawgiver. There is not a single hint of such a thing. By hypothesis the Jerusalem Jews had no idea that there was extant any book of Moses, or any book of Mosaic legislation, till Hilkiah found "*the* Book of the Law." The critical hypothesis is made all the more difficult by the fact that according to it the publication of JE must have been nearly contemporaneous with Hilkiah's discovery.

not absolutely forbid sacrifice elsewhere than in Jerusalem. It is expressly mentioned "if the place which the Lord shall choose be too far"[1] (R.V., Deut. xii. 21), then the Israelites were to be free to kill and eat of their flock and of their herd. This is clearly a sacrificial killing and eating, otherwise the distance from the sanctuary would not be important. Hence the temples at Heliopolis and Assouan, the erectors of which were unconscious of any breach of the Law. Important or public sacrifices were only to be offered at the national altar which represented the unity of the nation. But further, this change, whatever its scope, was not introduced by Josiah; a couple of generations before Josiah was born, Hezekiah had instituted the same reform (2 Kings xviii. 4). Rabshakeh endeavours to undermine the trust of the Jewish people in God by referring to these reforms of Hezekiah and the wholesale destruction of the High Places (Is. xxxvi. 7; 2 Kings xviii. 22). Mr Addis attributes these statements of Hezekiah's destruction of the High Places to the Deuteronomist. If that useful individual wrote during the reign of Josiah, all his readers would know whether or not he spoke the truth when he attributed the destruction of the High Places to Hezekiah. Burney (2 Kings, *loco*) would split up the narrative into four different strands. But the writing of these and the weaving of them together involves time, and the Samaritan Recension of the Pentateuch must have been complete in the days of Nehemiah. The conclusion cannot be avoided that the law of one sanctuary is as old as Hezekiah at the latest.

The Jewish tradition was that Deuteronomy was, in accordance with its name, *Mishneh hat-Torah*, "The Republication of the Law," or in Greek *Deuteronomion*, whence our "Deuteronomy." Although it is heresy even to hint such a thing, yet it would seem that a fairly good case can be made out for the traditional view. Reference has

[1] Singularly enough, the A.V. of this verse appears to have been translated from the Samaritan Recension, not the Massoretic — a blunder which has been taken over from Luther, who seems to have had the Vulgate in his mind but to have taken Jerome's *elegerit* for perfect subjunctive instead of future perfect. The Douay agrees with the R.V.

already been made to the peculiar dramatic and topographic suitability of Moses in the Plains of Moab choosing Ebal and Gerizim and the valley between them as the theatre of the solemn ceremony of the blessing and the cursing, and the unlikeliness of any Jerusalem Jew making such a choice. There was a dramatic suitability in Moses, as his solemn farewell of the people whom he had led so long, repeating the heads of the Law he had enjoined on them, and reminding them of the leading events in their previous history under his command. But a Jerusalem Jew, obsessed with the glories of David and yet more of Solomon, would have difficulty in orienting himself to the implied circumstances. Further, his efforts after topographic and dramatic fitness, even if most successful, would neither be recognised nor appreciated. The magnifying of the valley of Shechem above Mount Zion would tend to excite prejudice against the moral lesson to be taught. A moral teacher, especially if a Jew, as any one may learn from the Talmud, when devising a tale which is to be the vehicle of instruction would place every probability on one side in favour of the moral to be inculcated. It must never be forgotten that the artistic necessity of local colouring is a purely modern thing.

Then there are numerous signs of what to a plain man appear to be repetitions of what had already been narrated in the earlier books of the Law. The historical sections are avowed references to events recorded in Exodus and Numbers; in the J and E documents certainly, but thus far is revealed the writer's intention to repeat what had already been recorded. But P has historical portions also; in Num. xxxiii. 1-49, there is an account of the journeys of the Children of Israel; in Deut. x. 6-7, there is an extract from it; the account of the journeys is assigned to P. In that same chapter of Deuteronomy there is an account of the making of the Ark of the Covenant which has all the appearance of being a compendious reference to the fuller account in Exod. xxv. 10-22; but that whole section in regard to the Tabernacle and its furniture is part of the P document. A more striking case is Deut. xxiv. 8-9, "Take heed in the plague of leprosy, that thou observe diligently, and do accord-

ing to all that the priests the Levites shall teach you: as I commanded them, so shall ye observe to do." That there is a reference to some commands already given to the Levites is indubitable; any one but a critic would see these instructions to the Levites in the elaborate directions given to the priests by which they were to detect the disease, and the ceremonial restrictions under which they were to place the person infected to be found in Lev. xiii. and xiv. To avoid the deduction that there is a reference to the Levitical Law concerning leprosy, Dr Driver (*Com. Deut.*, p. 275) thinks it enough to say: "The Law, as it stands here, cannot be taken as a proof that Lev. xiii. and xiv. existed in its present shape at the time when Deuteronomy was written"; however, he admits that "it is sufficient evidence both that a Torah on the subject was in the possession of the priests, and the principles which it embodied were of recognised authority, and referred to Divine origin." Here is a divinely revealed Torah, in the hands of the priests, the principles of which were generally known—all this would suit Leviticus as a book known and read; Dr Driver advances no reason why it may not be here intended; and there do not seem to be any save the exigencies of the Wellhausen theory. Again, the Feast of Tabernacles is enjoined in Deut. xvi. 13-15, but no word is said as to how it is to be observed, the audience addressed are supposed to know all about the way in which it is to be kept, of what the booths were to be made, and the holy convocations connected with the feast. All these are fully given in Lev. xxiii. 33-44, which Dr Driver assigns partly to H and partly to P. He introduces two passages from Exodus, ascribed to JE (Exod. xxiii. 16; xxxiv. 22), as if they were the source of the Deuteronomic legislation; but these say nothing about "booths." He (*Com. Deut.*, p. 197) admits that the explanation of the term "booths" is given in Leviticus; why the Deuteronomic passage may not be held as referring to it is difficult to see, unless that it is contrary to the theory. These are by no means the only passages that might be quoted, in which to all but critics, there are references in Deuteronomy to the Priestly Code. On any reasonable system of evidence it must be held as

proved, that so far from the Priestly Code being composed a century and a half after Deuteronomy, the converse is the case, at least in regard to relative priority. Hence the presence of Leviticus in the Samaritan Recension of the Torah affords no reason for post-dating that recension.

But if the Law was brought by the priests sent by Esarhaddon then the Book of the Law contained Deuteronomy; but this contradicts the hypothesis of the critical school, that it was composed in the reign of Josiah and was palmed off upon him as an ancient document. Thus there is necessitated a further consideration of this discovery of the Law. How was this book found? There is no evidence that at that early date there was a library in the temple. It is against all criticism to believe even in Nehemiah's library (2 Macc. ii. 13). If there had been a library, of course the roll of the Law might have been found by Hilkiah as Bryennios found the MS. of the *Didache* in the library of the Patriarchate in Constantinople. But if that were so, the individualising of the copy has to be explained; it is *the* Book of the Law, it is a copy defined and separate from all other copies. Some people seem to picture to themselves that among the rubbish of broken utensils, worn-out robes, etc., which would be turned over, in the course of the repairs a roll turned up, the like of which they had not seen before, and was found to be Deuteronomy. Still this leaves unexplained on the one hand what made it so interesting and special, on the other wherein consisted its novelty.

May not the suggestion of Dr Edouard Naville be worthy of more consideration than it has received? Arguing from the custom among the Egyptians to place in the foundation of their temples portions of the "Book of the Dead," he maintains that the Book of the Law found by Hilkiah was the copy of the Law placed in the foundation of the temple by Solomon when it was founded. This would explain the individualisation of the copy. The finding of it is explained by the fact that masons were employed, which implies that the structure of the building needed looking to. The stone of which the temple was built was limestone, and no stone is more unequal in its consistence; sometimes it is hard

and crystalline, at others it is soft and friable. It might easily happen that some of the huge foundation stones might be showing signs of decay. The replacing of them might reveal *the* Book of the Law that had been placed there by Solomon. That Solomon would follow the Egyptian fashion is extremely likely from the affinity he had made with that country in marrying Pharaoh's daughter. If the practice continued, as it may well have done, the roll, if roll it was, would, when found, be at once recognised. There might be difficulty in reading it as the script would have become by that time archaic. Hilkiah passes it to Shaphan, a professional scribe, to decipher. The effect the perusal has on Josiah is due to the interest excited by the ancient copy coming to light; he had known that there was a law, but probably regarded it as a matter for the priests. The archaic lettering, that compelled attention to every word, would serve to deepen the impression conveyed by the contents.

There is nothing to indicate that it was only Deuteronomy that was found. We have seen reason to believe that the writer of that book expected the P document to be known to his readers; the knowledge of J and E are yet more clearly presupposed. So far as the narrative of the discovery is concerned, the whole Torah might have been inscribed on the roll which was found. The objection to this urged by some, is that the whole Law could not be read in the ears of the people (2 Kings xxiii. 2) in the course of a day. This, however, is not strictly true, as the whole Pentateuch could be read through in sixteen hours.[1] But there is no need to press the word "all," as Orientals are not so scrupulous in the use of words denoting totality; it would be enough if all the parts that mattered for the royal purpose of making the people recognise their serious condition were read. But it must be observed that it is "all the words of the Book of the Covenant" that were read.

[1] The rate at which this is calculated is that at which the Scripture is read in church. In the synagogue the rate of reading is much more rapid. The Samaritans claim to read the whole Law, interspersed with hymns, in the synagogue, between sunset and sunrise (see Chap. V., p. 134), on the Day of Atonement.

If this "Book of the Covenant" coincided with what critical opinion has denoted by that title, then it could have been read, at the rate above taken, in less than half an hour. The effect this reading had on king and people was due, not to the fact that the contents were absolutely novel, but to the realisation for the first time that the precepts were meant to be obeyed and had not been, and that in consequence a curse was impending.

If the idea of Naville that the copy of the Law found was that placed in the foundation of the temple by Solomon be pressed, then the Torah must have been already sacrosanct in the days of Solomon. This inevitably leads us back to the days of Samuel the Prophet at the latest. As an alternative theory to the traditional view that Moses wrote the whole Pentateuch, it might be suggested that it was under the Inspiration and Guidance of Samuel that the stories of Genesis were collected and the priestly and Levitical duties systematised. If the book of Deuteronomy in the main be assigned to Moses, and the other portions directly assigned to him are put to the one side and admitted to be Mosaic, at least in the main, then the Jehovist of the South and the Elohist of the North, with the writer of the Priestly Code are all to be dated between the Mosaic period and the time of Samuel, and consequently all be antedated by nearly three-quarters of a millennium. Samuel had formed the schools of the prophets; these a couple of centuries later became powerful political instruments in the hands of Elijah and Elisha. A similar development of a political agent from a religious order is seen in the history of the Egyptian monks of the fifth century. Religious and contemplative at the beginning, under the guidance of Cyril of Alexandria, and still more of his successor Dioscorus, they became formidable instruments in ecclesiastical politics. But the monks had other activities; most of the greater monasteries had libraries, and these were replenished mainly by the pens of the inmates. Unless the "Sons of the Prophets" had some literary activity of this sort, it is difficult to understand why they were gathered together into communities. If, like the mediæval monks, many of the members of the prophetic schools became scribes, then

the recording of the events in Genesis and Exodus might readily be understood.

These prophetic compilations need not have been merely the fixing in written form of popular legends floating about among the people. For much that is recorded there may have been documents. If Conder's theory is correct these primitive documents would be written in cuneiform, and some of them, at any rate, brought from Mesopotamia. It seems extremely probable that the accounts of Creation, of the Garden of Eden, of the Flood may have been on clay tablets in the possession of Abraham, as also the genealogies of the earlier patriarchs. In a similar way the histories of Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and even Joseph may have been preserved. Probably stone tablets would take the place of those of clay, if not before, at all events during the Wilderness journey. This may be regarded as indicated by the fact that the "Ten Words" were written on "tables of stone"; if so, the events of the forty years would be in that way recorded. Events connected with the conquest of Canaan not unlikely would thus also be preserved in memory. The statement of the boundaries of the different tribes, and the towns assigned to them, has the aspect of being an official document. The book of Judges certainly has more the look of a collection of legends; yet when it is compared with the ordinary tales of Orientals, as seen in the "Thousand and One Nights," the stories have a sobriety and restraint which suggest documents behind. Moreover, the Song of Deborah, the Story of Micah and the Danites, and that concerning the matter of Gibeah, have all the appearance of having existed independently, like the book of Ruth, which seems to have been, at one time, conjoined to the book of Judges. Later events would be recorded by the prophets as they occurred.

There is a circumstance to be noted here, referred to and somewhat developed in an earlier chapter, which has a bearing on the chronology of the evolution of Pentateuchal doctrines. While the writer of the book of Judges has no scruple in recording the deeds of Gideon under the name of Jerubbaal, and as may be learned from the book of Chronicles, Saul and Jonathan were deterred by no religious

scruple from calling their sons by names involving "Baal," in the next generation all this is changed, and "Baal" (Lord) becomes *bosheth*, "folly." Israel began to obey literally the precept of Exod. xxiii. 13, "Make no mention of the name of other gods, neither let it be heard out of thy mouth." This cannot be ascribed to scribal redaction, otherwise "Jerubbaal" would not so freely appear in the book of Judges. The reign of David appears to be the dividing line; before this the command was neglected, but after his accession it is observed. With David too begins reference to the Law; he urges his son Solomon (1 Kings ii. 3) to "keep the charge of the LORD thy God . . . as it is written in the Law of Moses." After this the references to the Law are not infrequent in Kings. Of course all these cases are called interpolations, and credited to the Deuteronomic Redactor. The sole evidence against these incriminated passages is the exigence of the theory; equally of course, this is not admitted. This method of ruling out everything that tends to the disproof of a theory is surely utterly unscientific. A free, and it is to be admitted a somewhat extensive application of it to Alison's *History of Europe* would enable one to justify the assertion that in that voluminous work there is no mention of Napoleon Bonaparte, all the hundreds of pages devoted to his exploits being ascribed to a Bonapartist Redactor. Only a little step and the work so expurgated might be quoted in support of Whately's *Historic Doubts of Napoleon Bonaparte.* Before such a method can claim to be scientific, those who use it must bring forward an analogous case in which a whole literature has been adulterated wholesale in the interest of certain opinions.

The subject, however, can be approached from another side—from the side of Samaritan history. Earlier by a generation than Josiah's renewal of his great-grandfather's effort to secure unity of worship was the mission of the Israelitish priests, under Esarhaddon's orders, to teach the Assyrian colonists the "manner of the God of the land." It is certainly not said that they brought with them a "Book of the Law," any more than it is said that Manasseh carried a copy with him to Samaria. The probability is rendered

considerable in the case of the priests by the fact that, as is well known, both Esarhaddon and his son Asshur-banipal were great collectors of rituals of worship, and of religious formulæ. This tendency on the part of these monarchs implies a similar tendency widely spread among their subjects. If that is so, neither would Esarhaddon, who sent these priests, nor would the colonists to whom they were sent, regard them as properly equipped if they merely could convey a verbal tradition as to the true ritual of JHWH's worship, but had no authenticating documents. When, a century and a half later, the Samaritans desire to co-operate with the Jews in rebuilding the temple, they claim that they have been worshipping JHWH since the days of Esarhaddon, and their claim is not disallowed. It has been shown to be impossible that Manasseh could have conveyed to the Samaritans their first knowledge of the Pentateuchal Law; hence that Law must have been brought to them at the latest by those priests from Assyria.

As, however, the Law which the Israelite priests brought with them from Assyria must have been that with which they had been acquainted, before they had been carried away into captivity, the Mosaic Law must have been obeyed in Israel before the fall of Samaria. This being so the question falls to be answered: When did they get the Torah? The Mosaic Law could not have been introduced by the dynasty of Jehu; even the greatest of that House, Jeroboam II., was at odds with the religious part of the nation. As has been shown in an earlier chapter, from the prophecies of Amos, the Mosaic ritual was quite understood in the time of Jeroboam II. Still less could Mosaism have been introduced by the dynasty of the House of Omri, with their sympathy with Baal-worship. The introduction of the worship by the calves at Bethel and at Dan renders any share in this revolution by Jeroboam the son of Nebat inconceivable. So the line is led again by another route through Solomon and David back to Samuel. The very eagerness with which David and Solomon pressed towards the erection of a central shrine proves the power over them of one of the ruling ideas of the Deuteronomic legislation. Their desire that the central shrine, the sacred hearth of the nation,

should be a temple not a tent only emphasizes this. The ritual of sacrifice followed by Solomon in the dedication of the temple is in strict accordance with the Priestly Code, even embracing the distinction between priests and Levites—a distinction that, according to critical opinion, was not recognised by the Deuteronomists; Dr Burney (Kings, p. 105) admits that the whole dedication ceremony is from the standpoint of P. As all Israel was present at the dedication of the Great Temple to JHWH, all the ceremonies would be observed and known to the whole people and have been acquiesced in by them. This is corroborative of Naville's suggestion that a copy of the Law, not merely Deuteronomy as he says, but the whole Law, complete in all essentials, was placed by Solomon in the foundation of the temple.

The completed law-book would seem, as has been shown above, to date back to the days of Samuel. But Samuel and the prophets were not authors so much as editors, so far as the Pentateuch is concerned. Further into antiquity the search for origins cannot be carried, unless the mounds of Egypt or the Tells of Palestine yield up from their hidden hoards of ostraka, clay tablets, or papyri information bearing on the question. There may have been collections of tales of the patriarchs preserved among the different tribes; and these may have mainly been segregated in Northern and Southern groups, comprising the E and the J documents respectively. While the components of Genesis may be divided perpendicularly and geographically into those from the North and those from the South, there are also traces of chronological strata. The traditions of Abraham have more of the primitive about them, more of the free air of the desert, than have the tales about Jacob, still more than those of Joseph. Nothing more perfectly primitive and Oriental can be conceived than the narrative of Abraham's purchase of the Cave of Machpelah. The contest in wits between Jacob and Laban is Oriental and primitive, but the primitive element is not so marked as in the Abrahamic narratives. A comparison of the histories of Genesis with Arabic traditional tales, reveals the brevity and still more the sobriety of the Bible narratives.

This implies that they were early committed to writing; probably the writing was cuneiform and incised on clay tablets originally: not impossibly in Canaan they adopted the script of the region. In default of clay suitable for tablets, the writing might be scratched on slabs of limestone, or plates of metal. In regard to these primitive narratives readers in these later days may see the influence of Divine Providence in the selection, composition, and preservation of them.

The stories of Creation and of the Flood probably were brought with the patriarchs from Mesopotamia. They, however, represent the tradition in a much more primitive form than they appear in the Creation tablets of Nineveh. Few narratives are more grotesque than the Babylonian story of the Creation by the splitting of Tehom, the mother of the gods, longitudinally into halves by her own grandson Marduk. One can more easily see the evolution of the Babylonian tale from the Hebrew than the reverse. The Babylonian narrative is much the longer and more elaborate. It is a maxim of criticism generally acknowledged, that other things being equal the shorter and simpler form of a legend is the more primitive. The likeness between the Babylonian tradition of the Flood and the Hebrew story of the Noachian Deluge is much greater than between the two Creation stories; but this only brings out more clearly the relatively primitive character of the Hebrew narrative; the Babylonian Noah brings into his ark with him his wealth and his slaves, an evidence of a much more developed state of society. Not unlikely the ethnological tables of Gen. x. were also equally primitive, though as they seem to reckon the nations from Palestine as a centre they probably were not of Babylonian origin. Most of this chapter is assigned to P and therefore must, in accordance with the critical hypotheses, have been written in Babylon notwithstanding its Palestinian outlook.

To thus placing the origin of the priestly document away back in the earlier limits of historic time there are several objections which have to be met. The most obvious and important is that prominent persons, so far as their actions are recorded in the historical books, ignore the prescriptions

of the Levitical Law and Deuteronomic Code, and so it may be argued that the Law was unknown. There is no word of Elijah, zealous though he is for JHWH of Hosts, going to worship at Jerusalem; the same thing must be said of Elisha. Though the *argumentum e silentio* is not at any time a safe one, yet with the full records of their lives given in the books of Kings the absence of all reference to the temple on Mount Zion is singular.[1] Further, Elijah's sacrifice on Carmel seems an intrusion on the priest's office. As to this last the relation of the prophetic to the priestly office is not defined; we do not know how far the divinely inspired seer might supersede the more customary action of the priest. In the Divine economy there is always room for the miraculous. This has been discussed above in a previous chapter.

But the ignoring of a law cannot be assumed as evidence that it was unknown, else it might be reasoned that the decalogue, or at all events the second commandment is unknown in all Roman Catholic Christendom. The second commandment forbids the making of images and worshipping them. Yet in every Catholic Church of any pretension there are images of the Saints, especially of the Virgin Mother, and before them kneeling worshippers. This is acquiesced in by men of whose piety there can be no doubt. We never read of St Anselm, St Francis of Assisi, or Blaise Pascal denouncing this disregard of the Law of God. They excused the practice by drawing a distinction between the worship offered to the images of the Saints and that offered to God. The prophets might justify their acquiescence in modes of

[1] The *argumentum e silentio* is peculiarly unsafe in regard to such annals as are found in the books of Kings. Although the accounts of the activities of the two conspicuous prophets Elijah and Elisha are recorded with relatively great fulness, yet the incidents related are all isolated to such an extent that their chronological succession is by no means certain. They may well have repeatedly worshipped at the shrine on Mount Zion and yet no note of this be preserved in the sacred books. If they were habitual worshippers there, and it were the note of the religious in Israel to do so (*cf.* Tob. i. 4), still less likely would it be to be recorded. The article in the *Encyclopædia Britannica* on William Wilberforce of anti-slavery fame never mentions that he attended church (see p. 82).

worship which seem to us in flagrant opposition to the Divine Law, by arguments as specious as do the Romanists their Saint-worship and image-worship. Further, when it is recollected how scanty is the knowledge we have of the state of matters in the Northern Kingdom of Israel great caution must be used in making deductions from such facts as are known.

The Samaritans are a dwindling race; indeed for aught that is known their last community, that in Nablus, may have been massacred during this war, as the numerous other communities of the race have been before this, by the Turks. It is well to retain what knowledge we have. So long as they remain they are witnesses for the nature of the Religion of Israel in primitive times. If, as has been said, the Jews are a testimony to the truth of Christianity then the Samaritans enhance that testimony by their own.[1]

To summarise the preceding argument—the endeavour has been to show that the Samaritans did not get the Pentateuch from Ezra but had it before. The reasons for this conclusion are as follows: (1) After the deportation of the leading inhabitants by Sargon, the great mass of the population left were still Israelites and therefore had the Israelite Religion in its original form, whether its ritual were regulated by legislation preserved in a book or not. (2) Their history proves that they held to their faith with great tenacity; enduring persecutions of intense severity from each successive sovereign power, whether heathen, Christian, or Moslem, without abjuring it. (3) From the prophets Hosea and more particularly Amos, it is proved that the Northern tribes knew and practised the Mosaic ritual long before the captivity of Samaria. They had at the same time a form of worship under the presidency of the prophets, analogous to that of the synagogue of later days. From these prophets also there is evidence that the histories of the Torah were known as well as its ritual. (4) It must be assumed that the mission of the priests from Esarhaddon is historical.

[1] This was written in 1917, but Rev. W. M. Christie, Tiberias, under date 21st March 1919, communicates the information that the Samaritan community was reported safe, numbering 152, and in possession of all their rolls.

The respect the Sargonids had for written *formulæ* of worship suggests that the priests in question would be supplied with these. Such a collection of ritual directions is found in the Torah, the Pentateuch. (5) As it was not part of the Law, the book of Joshua was not brought by the priests. Joshua was a prophetic book and the Ninevite government suspected the influence of the prophets; hence none of the prophetic books are in the Samaritan Canon. On the critical hypothesis that Manasseh carried the Law to Samaria, his omission to convey Joshua also is inexplicable. (6) The alleged finding of Deuteronomy, in the reign of Josiah, which would militate against this, is disproved (*a*) by the narrative of its discovery; it is "*The* Book of the Law" which Hilkiah says that they have found. Were it the copy of the Torah, not merely Deuteronomy, which, in accordance with Egyptian practice, Solomon had placed in the foundation of the temple, this individualisation would be intelligible. (*b*) Its contents prove that it could not have been written by a Jerusalem Jew to give Mosaic authority to the Psalmist's claim that JHWH had chosen Mount Zion to put His Name there; while Zion is never mentioned, Ebal and Gerizim are singled out for special notice. (*c*) Deuteronomy cannot have been written before the Priestly Code because in certain points it implies its existence, *e.g.*, the Law of Leprosy, and the way to observe the Feast of Tabernacles. (7) While the ritual of the Samaritans differs from that of the Jews only in minute points, these all indicate the Samaritan to be the simpler and more primitive. Consequently it is unlikely that they borrowed from the Jews. (8) Although the script of the Samaritans is practically identical with that of the Jews of the time of the Maccabees, the two did not alter in parallel lines. The Samaritan script has remained fixed, while the Jews have evolved the square character and the Rabbinic. (9) By comparing the two recensions we have endeavoured to show that they parted company when the manuscripts of both were written in a script like that found in Ba'al-Lebanon inscription, which appears to be contemporary with Solomon. (10) While it is almost impossible to believe that Ezra, a Babylonian scribe, who though a priest had never even seen a legitimate sacrifice,

could persuade the Jerusalem priests to remodel the system of ritual which they had practised for nearly a century in accordance with a document brought by him from Babylon, it is absolutely inconceivable, in the first place, that Manasseh, a priest banished by the influence of Ezra, would convey Ezra's Code to the place of his banishment, and endeavour successfully to enforce it on those around him there. In the next place, it passes belief that the Samaritans, despite their obstinate preference for their own customs, should accept from this runagate priest the Ezrahitic Code, with all its variations from the ritual to which they had been accustomed for centuries. They would, one should think, be all the less likely to accept this teaching from him as in accordance with it he had been banished. Some would post-date this flight of Manasseh by a century in accordance with Josephus. Besides the improbability in itself of this amended hypothesis, it is involved in the century which Josephus mysteriously omits.

For these reasons we venture to maintain that it is impossible to believe that the Pentateuch was only completed with the arrival of Ezra at Jerusalem.

As a parallel historical instance is frequently more illuminative than an abstract statement, we would suggest that a condition of things similar to that when Ezra arrived at Jerusalem from Babylon occurred at the rise of the Tractarian movement in Oxford in the early thirties. Neither Pusey nor Newman alleged that they had discovered a new and more authentic prayer-book; they asserted that the rubrics of the book in use were not observed, that the discipline implied in them was not enforced. Precisely similar was the attitude assumed by Ezra in regard to the Law, especially that relating to marriage with those of other nationalities. He did not profess to introduce a new Law, but denounced the non-observance of that given to their fathers at Mount Sinai.

Had the Tractarians in the beginning of the Oxford movement produced a brand new prayer-book and called upon all churchmen to adjust their worship to it, and to it alone, they would never have been listened to. Still less would Ezra have been obeyed in Jerusalem if Leviticus had never been heard of before he produced it. Its novelty would at once have condemned it.

APPENDIX I

MANUSCRIPTS OF THE SAMARITAN PENTATEUCH

In regard to every ancient writing, which has passed from the stage of manuscript to that of print, it is important that the authorities on which the printed text is founded should be known and estimated. In regard to the Samaritan Pentateuch this is all the more necessary that its variations from the Massoretic text are usually minute. Recognising this, Dr Blayney appends a list of MSS. in European libraries, and therefore open to scholars, to the preface of his transcription into the ordinary square character of the Samaritan text of Walton's Polyglot. These have been extracted from Kennicott's List of Hebrew Manuscripts. While Blayney gives a description of each he does not seem to have recognised the importance of the *tarikh*, i.e., the colophon inserted in the text of Samaritan MSS., which gives the name of the scribe, the date, and place of writing. In his text while he follows Walton he notes the variations from the polyglot text to be found in the different codices. Walton's text appears to have been taken from only one manuscript, and that a somewhat inaccurate one. About three-quarters of a century later Immanuel Deutsch wrote his article in Smith's *Dictionary of the Bible* on the Samaritan Pentateuch, and appended to it a list of manuscripts borrowed from Blayney's, leaving out one or two that were fragmentary and adding two which seemed to have disappeared. One is a fragment in the Ducal Library, Gotha; the other is said to be in the library of the Comte de Paris in London. Dr Deutsch only mentions, even with these two, eighteen manuscripts.[1]

[1] The writer has made every effort to get information about this codex which Dr Deutsch alleged to be in the library of the Comte de Paris in London, when he wrote in 1863. Thinking that the Count's library might be broken up, and its treasures dispersed, it occurred to him that it might be one of the codices in the Rylands Library about which Freiherr von Gall was unable to get full information. He made inquiries

A decided contrast to this is the list Freiherr von Gall inserts in the prolegomena to his edition of the Samaritan Pentateuch. The extent of the list is the first thing that strikes the reader. The Freiherr following the method of designation adopted by New Testament critics has used letters of the alphabet to denote the different MSS.; in this process he not only exhausts the whole Roman alphabet, but has to draw on the German black-letter alphabet to the extent of fifteen letters; thus he catalogues no less than forty "more or less complete" (*mehr oder weniger vollständige*) manuscripts. Besides these, he denotes some thirty groups of fragments of MS. rolls, and twenty-five groups of fragments from MS. codices. Several of the codices he has described very fully, transcribing into square character not only the *tarikh* which tells the name of the scribe, where and when he wrote, but also the note frequently appended which tells of the subsequent purchase of the codex by some person of wealth, with his genealogy. There is of course duly notified by Freiherr von Gall the number of sheets of paper or parchment used in its composition, the number of lines in the page, whether or not it is accompanied by the Targum or by an Arabic version in Samaritan characters. Eleven of the forty MSS. are merely denoted, not described; the only information given is regarding the place where it may be found and its present possessors: concerning one of these not even these items can be given as it has disappeared. Blayney relates that it had been bought for Kennicott from a Jew of Frankfort. At the death of Kennicott it was unfortunately sold and has in vain been sought for since. It had been in the possession of Hottinger, who as Kennicott has noted had added *variæ lectiones* from the Leyden MS. Scholarship has to thank Freiherr von Gall for his careful list of authorities, and for designating the different manuscripts by letters; thus one is enabled to refer succinctly to the different authorities for the text. It may be regarded as a piece of Teutonism on the part of the

at the authorities of that library, but found as elsewhere shown that it was not one of them. Knowing Dr Cowley's unrivalled knowledge in regard to things Samaritan, the writer put his difficulties before him. Dr Cowley very kindly made inquiries and discovered that the library of the Comte de Paris had not been broken up. Further, he endeavoured to get into communication with the Duc d'Orleans, the son of the Comte de Paris, but in vain. At Dr Cowley's advice the writer himself sent, on 8th December 1918, a letter to the Duc d'Orleans, as it was understood he would have his father's library, respectfully asking about the missing MS., expecting to have a note of some sort from the Duke's secretary; up to the time of writing, 20th April 1919, he has had no reply.

Freiherr that he begins his list with a codex, the only apparent reason for such a precedence being assigned to which is the fact that it is in the possession of the German University of Leipzig; and the letter A designates it. It has no claim to precedence either on account of its age, its history, or its completeness. One should have expected that the codex brought to Europe by Pietro della Valle, as that which first drew attention to the Samaritan Pentateuch, would have been named and designated first. It might possibly be answered that in New Testament criticism Codex A has no intrinsic merits to explain its apparent primacy. In the circumstances it may be convenient to adopt the designations of the leading MSS. which Freiherr von Gall has used; the more so that another independent text is not likely to be thought of for many decades to come. The following is a condensation of von Gall's list:—

A. University Library, Leipzig; consists of 160 leaves parchment; 32 lines to the page. It is imperfect at the beginning and end, beginning with Gen. xi. 31, and ends with Deut. iv. 37. The cryptogram is not complete, but as the scribe is the same who wrote the codex brought to Europe by della Valle in which the cryptogram is complete and gives the date, it may be assumed that this was written about A.D. 1345.

B. Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris, cat. 2 (Kennicott, 363), complete; consists of 254 leaves of parchment; 30 lines to the page. It is dated "in the seven hundred and forty-sixth year of the rule of the sons of Ishmael"; A.H. 746 = A.D. 1345. This manuscript was that, as said above, which Pietro della Valle brought to Europe in 1616. Whether it is earlier or later than that in Leipzig there is no means of deciding.

C. Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris, cat. 2 (Kennicott, 333); ff. 168; parchment; 36-39 lines to page; dated A.H. 885 (A.D. 1480-81). It begins Gen. i. 20. It has several lacunæ involving 6 ff.

D. Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris, cat. 3 (Kennicott, 221); ff. 284. It contains manuscripts of various dates; some of the leaves are paper, some parchment. Von Gall reckons no less than eleven different hands. The date from the cryptogram of D^{10}, A.H. 577 (A.D. 1181-82) to this date, von Gall would ascribe D^1; D^3 he would date the following century. There is a note of purchase of D^2; date, A.H. 885 (A.D. 1480-81).

E. Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris, cat. 4 (Kennicott, 364); ff. 169; not from one hand. The main portion of it from Exod. i. 1 (f. 46*b*) to end of Deuteronomy designated E^1; 35 lines to page. Genesis he designated E^2; 32 lines to page. The date of E^1 is A.H. 889 (A.D. 1484). At the end of Genesis there is a note of purchase dated A.H. 986 (A.D. 1578-79).

F. Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris, cat. 1 (Kennicott, 334); ff. 258; parchment; 24 lines to page. Begins Gen. xviii. 2 and ends Deut. vii. 5; it wants f. containing Lev. xiv. 40 to xvii. 4. The cryptogram is awanting, but von Gall would date it thirteenth century.

G. Universitäts Bibliothek, Leyden (Kennicott, 183); ff. 170; of various origin and age. The beginning of Genesis, ff. 1-4 (Gen. i. 1 to iv. 19), are by a very recent and European hand. The scribe painted rather than wrote the letters, without any knowledge of them, and paid no respect to punctuation. From Gen. iv. 19 to Num. v. 22 (ff. 5-111) designated G^1; 42 lines to page. From Num. v. 23 to xvi. 22 (ff. 112-122) G^2; 40 lines to page. From Num. xvi. 23 to Deut. xxxiii. 27 (ff. 123-169), G^3; 41 lines to page. The last f. contains the end of Deut. from xxxiii. 28 to conclusion. The cryptogram at the end of G^3 is dated A.H. 751 (A.D. 1350).

H. Imperial Public Library, Petrograd; ff. 134; parchment; 39-41 lines. Main portion Gen. xxvi. 21 to Deut. xiv. 23, designated H^1. From Deut. xxiii. 7 to xxxiv. 12 by another hand, designated H^2. The beginning and other missing portions supplied by a modern hand, designated h. Date of H^1, A.H. 840 (A.D. 1436-37).

I. Imperial Public Library, Petrograd; ff. 226; parchment. Gen. i. 16 to end of Deuteronomy; 32-35 lines. Written in Cairo, A.H. 881 (A.D. 1476).

K. Ambrosian Library, Milan (Kennicott, 197).

L. Vatican Library, Rome (Kennicott, 503).

M. Vatican Library, Rome (Kennicott, 504), formerly in the Barberini Library; ff. 266, of which 182 are old and parchment, the rest paper written by a later hand. Three columns on the page—Hebrew, Aramaic, Arabic; 42-44 lines a column. Date of M^1, A.H. 624 (A.D. 1226-27). Various hands represented in the rest; part dated A.H. 887 (A.D. 1482).

N. British Museum, London; ff. 254, 4to; parchment. Contains the whole Pentateuch; it is interleaved with white paper; 31-32 lines; date, A.H. 764 (A.D. 1362).

O. British Museum, London. The whole Pentateuch with Arabic version.

P. British Museum, London. Parchment; ff. 97; contains the whole Pentateuch; date, A.H. 845 (A.D. 1441-42); 45-52 lines.

Q. British Museum, London. Parchment; ff. 254, 4to; wants beginning and end of Pentateuch; f. 1 in tatters; fragments of Gen. iii. 14 to v. 2; f. 2 begins v. 3 and ends with Deut. xxix. 9.; date, A.H. 761 (A.D. 1359-60); 32-33 lines.

R. British Museum, London. Vellum; ff. 223; date, thirteenth century.

S. British Museum, London. Paper; ff. 119. A.D. 1494 has some restorations.

T. British Museum, London. Paper; ff. 451, 8vo; A.D. 1759.

U. British Museum, London. Paper; ff. 271, 4to; date, 1356.

V. British Museum, London. Parchment; ff. 199; 32 lines; date, A.H. 740 (A.D. 1339-40). Written by the same hand as A and B.

W. Bodleian Library, Oxford (Kennicott, 61). Belongs to a set of six copies of which N is also one. Von Gall traces eleven hands at work; approximate date seventeenth century; varies from 29 to 35 lines. Material partly paper and partly parchment.

X. Bodleian Library, Oxford (Kennicott, 62). Parchment; very imperfect. It is mainly the work of two hands. There is an Arabic version parallel with the Hebrew, written in Samaritan characters. A portion of it is dated A.H. 931 (A.D. 1525).

Y. Bodleian Library, Oxford (Kennicott, 63). Parchment mainly, compiled, and by various hands. It is of different dates. Dr Cowley has identified the work of eleven different scribes in all. One of these, Y^3, is dated A.H. 741 (A.D. 1340-41).

Z. Bodleian Library, Oxford (Kennicott, 64). Partly parchment, partly paper; ff. 188. The portions in parchment

are ff. 3, 4, 170-177; the body of the codex ff. 5-169 are in paper; another hand has supplied f. 2 and ff. 178-182. The codex thus still incomplete appears to have been brought to Europe and completed.

A. Bodleian Library, Oxford (Kennicott, 65). Parchment, except from Deut. xxxiii. 1 to end; ff. 258; small format, 5·2 inches by 4, from 24 to 33 lines. This codex belonged to Archbishop Marsh, the gift of Huntington, who had bought it in Nablus in 1690. The original MS. is dated A.H. 911 (A.D. 1505). The leaf in paper was written the same year as Huntington secured it.

B. Bodleian Library, Oxford (Kennicott, 66). Parchment; ff. 132; very small format, 3·6 inches by 2. It begins with Gen. iv. 1, and ends with Deut. xxxi. 2. Dated according to cryptogram, A.H. 721 (A.D. 1321).

C. Westminster College, Cambridge (England). The gift of Mrs Lewis and Mrs Gibson. Mostly parchment; ff. 380. It is in two columns on the page, Hebrew on the right, Arabic in Samaritan characters left. Date by cryptogram, A.H. 909 (A.D. 1504); improved and completed, A.H. 1306 (A.D. 1888).

D. University Library, Cambridge (England). Parchment; ff. 244 (paper 1-4, 243, 244); dated A.H. 610 (A.D. 1213); 30 lines.

E. University Library, Cambridge (England); ff. 312, of which 2-305 are parchment; f. 1 and ff. 306-312, modern completion on paper. Gen. i. 11 to Deut. xxx. 11. There are two columns on the page, Hebrew and Arabic version. Date, A.H. 616 (A.D. 1219-20).

F. Public Library, New York; completed at beginning and end with paper; ff. 275; from ff. 3 to 269, parchment; 26-29 lines; date, A.H. 629 (A.D. 1231-32).

G. The property of David Solomon Sassoon, Esq., London. Parchment mainly, completed with paper. Very small format, 4 inches by 3·2; ff. 450. Date a little doubtful as cryptogram defective. Von Gall thinks it may belong to the end of the fourteenth or the beginning of the fifteenth century.

H. (Kennicott, 299). Since the death of Kennicott in 1783 this MS. has disappeared. It was interleaved and was dated 1610.

𝔍. The property of Dr Gaster, London. Parchment; ff. 219, of which 13 are recent, and paper. Written in Cairo; date, A.H. 915 (A.D. 1509-10).

𝔎. Rylands Library, Manchester. Dated A.H. 608 (A.D. 1211).

𝔏. Rylands Library, Manchester. Has Arabic version. Egypt; dated A.H. 729 (A.D. 1328).[1]

𝔐. Rylands Library, Manchester. Has Arabic version and vowel signs.

Through the kindness of my friends, Dr Rendel Harris and the Rev. J. C. Nicol, M.A., Eccles, Manchester, I am enabled to supplement the list of MSS. given by von Gall, with a description of the codices in the Rylands Library, Manchester.

Rylands No. I. (designated by von Gall 𝔎). Vellum. Leaves 300; lines to page 26; total height 10·9 inches, breadth 9·2; text, height 7·2, breadth 5·9. It is written in bold Majuscular characters. The text begins on the outer side of the first leaf. This first page is largely illegible; it suffers also from the bottom of the first leaf having been torn away; the second page suffers also in that mutilation. The last four leaves consist of four fragments, amounting altogether to the equivalent of one full page. The third last page ends with disconnected letters in Samaritan. This codex has probably been written for liturgic use.

The *Tarikh* is as follows:—"I, Abi Berahhathah, son of Ab Sason, son of ibn Moshe, son of Abraham, examined and copied this holy Torah for the two brothers, Tobiah and Asaph, sons of Sa'deh, son of Izhaq, in the year 608 of the rule of the sons of Ishmael." This is equivalent in our reckoning to A.D. 1211.

Rylands No. II. (Library No. E. Designated by von Gall 𝔏). Vellum. Double columns; Hebrew with Arabic version. Leaves, 220; lines, from 45 to 50. Complete, save that the first three leaves have been torn at the bottom. Total height 13·8 inches, breadth 11·8; height of text varies from 9 to 10·1, breadth 8·3 to 8·6.

The *Tarikh:* "This holy Torah has been copied by the slave, poor before his rich God, Habib, son of Yaqub the copyist, son of Musellimal Nazir for Yaqub, son of Yukasah

[1] This is a mistake in arithmetic on the part of von Gall; the real date is 1321.

(and it is two complete copies) in the month Muharram, in the year 721 of the rule of the sons of Ishmael." This gives the date in our reckoning A.D. 1321. Freiherr von Gall notes that it was copied in Egypt.

Rylands No. III. (Library No. V. Designated by von Gall ℵ). This codex has been compiled from fragments in different handwritings, with many and extensive *lacunæ;* some of these have been filled up from Blayney's transcription, retranscribed into Samaritan characters. The fragments from the different books of the Pentateuch are segregated, and the different handwritings are indicated by a distinguishing letter. Leaves 158;—Gen. 1-18, Exod. 19-62, Lev. 63-90, Num. 91-124, Deut. 125-158. The different portions differ in height and breadth. Genesis is uniform throughout; total height 9·3 inches, breadth 7·5; text, height 6·4, breadth 5·5; lines to page 28. Exodus and the other books are made up of fragments by many different hands; total height 10·3 inches, breadth 8·5; height of text 7 inches, breadth 6; lines to page, varying from 23 to 27. There is no *tarikh*, consequently the date of the various portions is a matter of conjecture. According to von Gall it has an Arabic version. The last leaf is torn vertically, and the greater part of the text is awanting.

Rylands No. IV. (not mentioned by von Gall). This codex consists of 179 leaves; total height 12·8 inches, breadth 9; text, height 8·4 inches, breadth varying, but maximum 6·2. It contains Genesis and Exodus with Arabic version in double columns, Hebrew and Arabic. Three wanting at the beginning. This codex is in beautifully clear handwriting.

א. The property of W. Scott Watson, Esq., West New York, N.J. Parchment; ff. 80. Grant Bey had also ff. 35 of this codex. The date of this codex has occasioned a good deal of discussion. The date in the cryptogram is A.H. 35 (A.D. 655-56). Even if למלכת בני ישמעאל is taken strictly, and the date is reckoned from the conquest of Palestine, the matter is not seriously improved. From the fact that the cryptogram has been somewhat carelessly written, and possibly that שבע מאהנ has been omitted, the date then may be A.H. 735 (A.D. 1335).

ס. Originally in the possession of George Zeidan, a Syrian Christian in Cairo. The exorbitant price of £20,000 was asked for it. Its date was declared to be A.H. 116

(A.D. 734). Dr Cowley from the cryptogram dates it A.H. 901 (A.D. 1495).

P. Kgl. Bibliothek, Berlin; contains ff. 279, two columns on page, Hebrew and Arabic versions. It begins with Gen. xi. 4, and ends with Deut. xxxiii. 28; wants Deut. xxviii. 45-63; lines on page 40; date, A.H. 890 (A.D. 1485).

The above are the principal authorities made use of by Freiherr von Gall in the preparation of his text. There are besides numerous fragments of rolls and codices which he describes with great particularity. These descriptions and valuations must, however, be left to the scholar to consult in the prolegomena which von Gall has appended to his edition of the Samaritan Pentateuch.

APPENDIX II

DESCRIPTION OF THE NABLUS ROLL

THE most interesting of the manuscripts of the Samaritan Pentateuch, if not the most important, is the Nablus Roll, for which so high an antiquity is claimed. Although there is a pretence of showing it to every band of tourists who in their visit to the Holy Land pass through Nablus, this precious manuscript is really shown to very few. The High Priest and his colleague have several copies of the Law in roll form; one or two of these are exhibited. Even those while shown by the priest are held in his hand, and no opportunity is afforded the student of anything like an examination of them. The semi-darkness of the synagogue in which the exhibition takes place, a darkness intensified by the brilliance of the light outside, would make any examination difficult even for the exceptional tourist who can read Samaritan.

As the silver case in which the Roll is kept is the first thing the visitor sees, it may be well to consider it. Sir William Muir in his *Life of Mohammed*, to show the relative worthlessness of traditional evidence, brings together the various traditions concerning the ring of Mohammed, its history, its material, how he wore it, etc., and shows how the traditions, though supposed to be those best authenticated, contradicted each other. Scarcely less contradictory is the evidence of travellers in regard to the case of this Samaritan Roll. As to the material, Dr Mills, who twice visited Nablus, in 1855 and in 1860, and stayed three months in Nablus on the second of these occasions, says that it is silver. On the other hand Dr Spoer who visited Nablus in 1906 says "the case is . . . of brass inlaid with silver." Similar variation is observable in the accounts that are given of the ornamentation of it.

Without further analysis, the descriptions of various observers may be given. Dr Mills thus describes how it

appeared to him. "Having removed its red satin cover, which was ornamented with Samaritan inscriptions embroidered in golden letters, I found it was kept in a cylindrical silver case which opened on two sets of hinges, made so as to expose a whole column of reading. This case was ornamented with relievo work descriptive of the sacred contents of the Tabernacle." In a note he subjoins a description by Grove in *Vacation Tourists*. "It (the case) is a beautiful and curious piece of work; a cylinder of about 2 feet 6 inches long, and 10 or 12 inches in diameter, opening down the middle. One of the halves is engraved with a ground-plan of the Tabernacle, showing every post, tenon, veil, piece of furniture, vessel, etc., with a legend attached to each. The other half is covered with ornament only, also raised. It is silver, and I think—but the light was very imperfect—parcel gilt." Although Mills quotes the passage without comment, it would seem that in some points it does not agree with his own description. Dr Mills speaks of "two sets of hinges," implying that the cylinder was divided into three, whereas Mr Grove speaks only of "halves," *e.g.*, "one of the halves," "the other half." Further, the height assigned to the containing cylinder by Grove does not suit the measurement Mills gives of the height of the writing in the Roll, *i.e.*, 13 inches, and 15 inches as the height of the Roll; the margin of 15 inches thus left for the case seems much too large.

In 1906 Dr Spoer published in the *Journal of the Oriental Society* (vol. xxvii., p. 107) an account of this case which differs very much from the descriptions given above. It is as follows: "The case is cylindrical, 20 inches long, of brass inlaid with silver. It consists of three sections forming a circle of 6½ inches in diameter. The middle section is connected with the other two by three hinges on either side. That the present hinges may be of later date than the case itself seems probable from the fact that in two cases they conceal letters forming part of the inscription. Several letters are also missing from the perpendicular inscription to the right of the lower central panel, where a fragment of brass has been lost and a patch inserted. The top and the bottom are closed by three segments of brass forming a circle, so that the manuscript was completely enclosed for its better protection. It is secured by long brass hooks fastening into faceted knobs pierced with eight holes. The top is decorated with a turreted border.

"Every section is divided horizontally into two panels,

separated by a band outlined in silver. A geometrical design in silver decorates the centre of every panel; it consists of an arabesque, contained in a circle running out into four ornamental spear-heads.

"The dividing line is $1\frac{1}{8}$ inches in breadth inlaid in silver, with an inscription in Samaritan characters enclosed in a sort of cartouche, ending in ornamental spear-heads. This inscription continues round the case, as does also a second in smaller characters, in a continuous band, top and bottom. Right and left of the lower central panel is an additional inscription in small characters. All these are in Hebrew, in the Samaritan alphabet. The words are separated by dots."

There follow transcriptions and translations of the various inscriptions. Two of these are quotations from Scripture—from the priestly benediction (Num. vi. 24)—and the words which Moses used when the Tabernacle was to move (Num. x. 35). Two of the inscriptions related to the manufacture of the case. These are interesting, as giving the date when it was made. "In the name of Yah—this case for the holy writing was made in Damascus by the poor servant, the least of the creatures of God, Abu haph-Phetach ben Yoseph ben Yaqob ben Tzophar, of the tribe of Manasseh. May Yah forgive his sins. Amen. In the year nine hundred and thirty of the rule of the sons of Ishmael. At the hand of Yitzhaq the . . . ." The inscription within the lower central panel is as follows: "Written by Pin'has the son of Eleazar." The equivalent date in our era to A.H. 930 is A.D. 1524. In addition to his description Dr Spoer shows photographs which illustrate his meaning; there is a photograph of each of the portions of the case.

When these descriptions are compared, there would seem to be two if not three several cases. That seen by Mill and Grove, if even they describe one and the same case, clearly differs from that seen by Spoer. As already remarked, the material of the case is different; according to Spoer it is brass inlaid with silver, whereas that seen by Mill and Grove was silver. Moreover, as indicated above, there is at least a possibility that Mill and Grove describe different cases.

Photographic evidence confirms the former of these distinctions. In Dr Montgomery's work, *The Samaritans*, there is a photograph of the case of the Nablus Roll, and the ornamentation suits the description given by Grove and Mills, but not at all that of Spoer. This photograph is from a plate taken for the Palestine Exploration. Spoer

also has photographs as above mentioned which support his description. But besides that published in Montgomery, there are other photographs issued by the Palestine Exploration Fund; one of these exhibits the middle filled with a continuous arabesque; at the top and bottom an ornament like an arcade occupying each about three-sixteenths of the entire space—each arch filled with arabesque work. The case is composed of three portions as is Spoer's. When the Palestine Exploration photograph, of which we speak, is examined, a little bit of a second side is seen which appears to repeat that fully exhibited. It may be that what is shown in Montgomery's plate is a third side; it shows the edge of another side which seems to have an arabesque, like that on the P.E.F. photograph above referred to; certainly the satin covering is the same.

There are thus clearly two cases. That described by Spoer, dated in the sixteenth century, and that described by Mills and photographed by the Palestine Exploration Fund; this latter is to all appearance much the older. To this may be added a statement made to the present writer by Yaqub Shellaby, the High Priest in 1898, that Baron Rothschild had presented them with a case for their Torah! This assertion is not worthy of much credit, as it was associated with a number of imaginative statements. So far as the present writer's memory goes, the case seen by him on Mount Gerizim in 1898 coincides with that described by Dr Mills and figured in the photographs of the Palestine Exploration Fund. On the other hand a friend who visited Nablus in 1910 thinks that the case he saw was like that described by Spoer.

More important than the case is the manuscript within it. Of this Mills gives a very careful account, although he admits that he was not able to examine the whole of it. His description is as follows: "The roll itself is of what we should call parchment, but of a material much older than that, written in columns 13 inches deep, and $7\frac{1}{2}$ inches wide. The writing is in a fair hand, though not nearly so large or beautiful as the book-copies which I had previously examined. The writing being rather small, each column contains from seventy to seventy-two lines, and the whole roll contains a hundred and ten columns. The name of the scribe is written in a kind of acrostic, and forms part of the text running through three columns, and is found in the book of Deuteronomy." In a note Dr Mills explains that he did not himself see this, but that he gave it on the

authority of Yaqub Shellaby who had shown him the ancient roll in secrecy, and despite very considerable obstacles. To call the *tarikh* an acrostic is not perhaps a very intelligible descriptive name, only it would be difficult to suggest a better. "Whether it be the real work of the great-grandson of Aaron, as indicated in the writing, I leave the reader to judge; the roll, at all events, has the appearance of a very high antiquity, and is wonderfully well preserved considering its venerable age. It is worn out and torn in many places and patched with re-written parchment; in many other places, where not torn, the writing is unreadable. But it seemed to me that about two-thirds of the original is still readable. The skins of which the roll is composed are of equal size and measure each 25 inches long and 15 inches wide" (Mills, *Modern Samaritans*, pp. 312, 313).

In 1861 Dr Rosen conveyed in a letter to Dr Fleischer a description of the Nablus Roll which he had received from a Hebrew Christian, named Kraus, which is as follows:—

"The manuscript is a roll and consists of one and twenty rams' skins, according to the assurance of the priest, taken from rams offered as thank-offerings. These skins are only written on the hair side: they are of unequal size, so that while the majority have six columns of text, some have only five: they are artistically bound together by thongs of the same material. If, as the priest maintained, it has been in use, though very carefully handled, for many centuries, the effect is yet noticeable in its very bad condition. The parchment which in many places is as thin as writing paper, appears often torn and holed, and especially frequently blackened in a way as if the ink had run over it. According to Herr Kraus, there may at most be half of it still legible, which in the meantime, since the text remains undoubted, can scarcely be regarded as a hindrance to scientific knowledge. Only one column of Deuteronomy (xix. 8, ff.) is fully preserved and can be read from top to bottom throughout. Since the whole text of the Pentateuch occupies at the most 120 columns or sides (pages), and each ram's skin, prepared for parchment, contains five or six such columns, it is clear that the writing must be very close. This indeed necessarily is the case, since each column contains more than seventy finely written lines: the spaces which frequently break in constitute a further contraction of the space available for writing on. The writing is about a line high, and about the same breadth is the space between. A free space of at most a finger's

breadth is left between individual books. In short, the space is very carefully used, and only before a paragraph, or at the end of a column are the letters much separated one from another, for the sake of rendering it possible to begin a new line or column with a complete word."

Another interesting description was read by Dr Loewy to the Society of Biblical Archæology (*Proceedings*, 2nd December 1879). It is from the pen of a Samaritan. Dr Loewy found it among MSS. of the Earl of Crawford and Balcarres. In the *Proceedings* it is a summary which is given, so the narrative is in the third person. "The Roll was opened by him on the 8th of *dhel-kadi* A.H. 1125 (A.D. 1713), corresponding to the ninth month of the Samaritan year." If this is reckoned from Tishri, the beginning of the civil year, this would be the month Sivan, equivalent to our May; if from Nisan, the beginning of the sacred year, it would mean the month Kisleu, nearly our November. The rest of the date is given in accordance with the Samaritan reckoning:—"the 6152nd year since the creation of Adam, and 3352nd of the settlement of the Children of Israel in the Land of Canaan. The Roll is declared to be the identical copy which was written by Abishua, the great-grandson of Aaron, as is attested by the *tashkil* or intertextual chronogram. The writer, Maslam ibn Marjan, observes that for more than a hundred years no one had examined this copy of the Pentateuch. Solemn religious preparation had been made by Maslam before he ventured to peruse the sacred writing. When he went to the synagogue for this purpose he was attended by several of the synagogal officials and some of their children. Immediately after the section commencing "Hear, O Israel," etc. (Deut. vi. 4-9), he found the inscription consisting of the following words:—

אני, אבישע, בן, פינחס, בן, אלעזר, בן, אהרן, הכהן, הגדל, להם, רצון, יהוה,
וכבודו, כתבתי, הספר, הקדש, בפתח, אהל, מועד, בהר,
גריזים, שנת, שלשה, עשר, למלכת, בני, ישרעל,
ארץ, כנען, לגבולותיה, סביב, אודה, את, יהוה.

"I Abishua, the son of Pinḥas, the son of Eleazar, the son of Aaron the High Priest—on them be the favour of JHWH and His glory—wrote the Holy Book at the door of the Tabernacle of the Congregation in Mount Gerizim in the

year thirteen of the possession of the Children of Israel of the Land of Canaan, according to its boundaries round about. I praise JHWH."

The *tashkil* concludes at the sentence, "If thou shalt hear say in one of thy cities, which JHWH thy God hath given thee" (Deut. xiii. 12).

Maslam describes his joy in discovering this chronogram. He makes the observation that only the letters ז and ה were missing from the *tashkil*. The reason that they are wanting is that they occur at the bottom of the columns, and the bottom of the folio had been worn away. The same reading was collated afterwards by the witnesses who accompanied Maslam ibn Marjan. This evidence disposes of the doubts which Deutsch expressed as to the colophon being really present at all. In his article in Smith's *Dictionary of the Bible*, Dr Deutsch insinuated that the discovery which Levysohn professed to have made was untrue.

In his edition of the Samaritan Pentateuch, Freiherr von Gall gives Dr Cowley's explanation of the *tashkil* which is: There was a High Priest who had two sons, Pinḥas and 'Amram, who were also High Priests. The son of the latter, the High Priest Ithamar, came in the year A.H. 602 (A.D. 1205-6) from Damascus to Shechem. A cousin of this Ithamar might be the Abishua who wrote this mysterious roll. The "thirteenth year of the rule of the Children of Israel in the Land of Canaan and its limits round about" would really mean, the emigration from Damascus "from the limits round about" to Shechem in Israel. Something may be said for the first part of this, although there is no need for limiting the Pinḥas, the father of the scribe, to one whose father was Eleazar, as Eleazar was a stem name. The great apostasy according to the Samaritans was when Eli transferred the High Priesthood from the race of Eleazar to that of Ithamar. It is difficult to accept the latter portion. There is no trace of the emigration of a few Samaritans from Damascus to Nablus ever being regarded as important enough to form an era. The whole of the Samaritan community in Damascus cannot have migrated to Shechem, as four hundred years later there was a considerable number of Samaritans still in Damascus. As only one column in Deuteronomy can be read throughout, any number of words and letters may have been lost over and above the two letters which Maslam acknowledges, so any number of hundreds may have preceded the "thirteen." Nothing can be settled until the MS. is examined again.

Let us hope it has not been destroyed by the Turks or removed by their masters.

There are, or in present circumstances it may be more correct or at least safer to say, were in the Samaritan synagogue two rolls, in addition to the most ancient roll of which a description has been given above. These were shown to tourists, first the one, then if the tourist, knowing the practice the Samaritan priesthood had of showing a more recent roll to save the sacred document from contamination, should ask for the real ancient manuscript, the second was brought. These have not been described with any care. In regard to one of them I can say it is taller than the ancient roll, and the case in which it is, or was kept is severer in design than the more ancient case.

There are probably several other rolls, in the possession of the Samaritans, of various ages and values. Of course no one can tell what devastation has been wrought by the Turks, or how many of these, if any, have escaped the mania for unreasoning destruction which seems to affect not only the Turks but even more their temporary masters the Germans.

(*The above was written in the summer of* 1917.)

APPENDIX III

THE RELATION OF THE MINOAN ALPHABET TO THE SEMITIC

THE discoveries made by Sir Arthur Evans in Crete, and the evidences afforded by them of an advanced civilisation naturally excited considerable speculation. The thoughts of scholars were directed to the traditional stories of the realm of Minos preserved in Hellenic literature. On the other hand archæologists were prone to connect the Cretan discoveries with those of Schliemann in Mykenæ and Troy. One peculiarity which had been observed in regard to the civilisation of primitive pre-Homeric Greece was the singular want of any signs of writing. M. Perrot (Perrot and Chipiez, *Primitive Greece* (Eng. trans.), vol. ii., p. 462) says: "What most strikes the historian who sets about to define pre-Homeric culture, is its having been a stranger to writing. It knows neither of the ideographic signs which Egypt and Chaldæa possessed, nor of that alphabet which Greece will borrow somewhat later of Phœnicia." In contrast with this Sir Arthur Evans found, not only not a few inscriptions, but also a collection of documents on tablets of half-baked clay. Discoveries so important as those made in Crete, which seemed to have a bearing in so many different directions, classical and archæological, were naturally liable to produce an amount of mental excitement which would tend to the exaggeration of their significance. The news of the discovery of the foundations of Ahab's Palace in Samaria led to the story being published that letters to Ahab were found which had been sent to him from Shalmanesar II., and, greater marvel still, from Asshur-bani-pal who lived some three centuries after Ahab was in his grave. In estimating the influence on our ideas of primitive times, which may be derived from Cretan discoveries, care has to be exercised lest this influence should be exaggerated.

One of the cases in which the conclusions of Sir Arthur

Evans must, we think, be scrutinised with special care is that in regard to the origin of the Semitic, or as he calls it, the Phœnician alphabet. What evidence he adduces is to a large extent assumptive. He assumes that the Cretan civilisation was contemporaneous with that of Mykenæ and Troy; but the lack of any evidence that the people of those days had any mode of making their thoughts permanent, whether ideographically or phonographically, appears to prove definitely that the Minoan civilisation is later. The finding of an *alabastron* with the cartouche of the Hyksos King Khyan (*Scripta Minoa*, p. 30) does not prove that the reign of Khyan falls within the Minoan period. Had there been many of these *alabastra*, the inference would have been a fairly valid one; but in the circumstances the natural deduction is that the Hyksos King had a date considerably, perhaps very much earlier.[1] The kinship of the Cretan signs, presumed to be alphabetic, to those of Cyprus and Lycia does not carry the inquiry much further. Appeal is made to the story of Bellerophon as told by Homer. He was sent by Proetus his father to Lycia, with a folded tablet addressed to his stepmother's father, and on it were impressed σήματα λυγρά, "destructive signs." It does not necessarily follow from the fact that there were alphabetic symbols among the Lycians that these σήματα were other than vague symbols, such as savages of a lower stage frequently use. But even though Homer intended to suggest alphabetic writing, it does not follow that at the date implied by the story (so much earlier than that when the Homeric poem was composed) any such thing was known. There thus seems to be decided failure of anything like evidence for a very early date to the Minoan script.

The lack of any tradition associating the Greek alphabet with Crete or Minos is strong evidence against that being its source. The more advanced the civilisation ascribed to Crete, the greater the extent of its commerce, the more pervading the political influence of the Minoan Empire, the more difficult it becomes to explain why, if the Hellenes got their alphabet from Crete, Crete never got the credit

[1] In my study as I write, I have a brick from a temple mound in Mugheir; there is on it an inscription in the oldest form of cuneiform. Were such a disaster to befall our Island Empire as befell that of Minos, and were the archæologists of the fiftieth century A.D. to find it in the ruins of Edinburgh, they would scarcely be justified in deducing from it that our civilisation belonged, not to the twentieth century A.D. but to the twentieth B.C.

for it. On the other hand, the tradition is that they got their alphabet from Phœnicia through Cadmus. Herodotus records this tradition with all particularity (v. 58): "The Phœnicians who came with Cadmus . . . introduced into Greece upon their arrival a great variety of arts, among the rest that of writing." Confirmatory of this view are the names given to the letters. All the original letters have Semitic names, hellenised only to the degree necessary to fit them for Greek accidence. Thus *aleph* becomes *alpha* and *beth*, *beta*. If Sir Arthur is correct, and the Semitic, or as he calls it the Phœnician alphabet, is derived from the Minoan, why did Hellenic tradition pass over the nearer source and ascribe the introduction of letters to the more distant, if it were not the truth?

Another argument which seems to us conclusive is that the names of the letters are significant in Semitic, and the forms assumed by them are derived from pictographs of the object. It is true that in some cases there is a doubt as to the meaning of the name on the one hand, and a dubiety on the other as to the object indicated. This, however, applies only to some of the letters; in regard to a number there is practical agreement. Sir Arthur Evans himself has no doubt of *aleph* being a pictograph of an ox's head conventionalised. Equally general is the recognition that *beth* represents a "tent," only the essential lines being indicated. The fourth letter *daleth* in its earliest form represents a "tent-door"; it becomes in Greek *delta*. There is some difference concerning the third, *gimel*. By Gesenius it was supposed to represent a "camel"; certainly the earliest shape the character assumes has a striking resemblance to the head and neck of a camel. It was objected by Colonel Conder that the vowels of the word *gamal*, "camel," were not those for the letter; but its name in Syriac is vocalised as is the word for a "camel." In the Greek name *gamma* the final *l* is not represented; this, however, may be due to the probability that the Phœnicians called this third letter by the name *gaman* by which it was known to the Samaritans; the *n* sound is more fluid even than *l* with which it is frequently interchanged. The camel was not indigenous to Phœnicia or Palestine, so it may well have been that the inhabitants of South-Western Syria got the alphabet before they were acquainted with the animal; hence the Phœnicians changed the last consonant, and the Jews the vocalisation. We venture to maintain that *gimel* represents a "camel," notwithstanding that Sir Arthur

Evans assures his readers that this view is generally abandoned. The resemblance of the sign to a camel's head and neck is the closer the nearer one comes to the origin of the alphabet. This at once is clear on comparison of the forms assumed by the letter on the Moabite and Siloam inscriptions on the one hand, and that on the inscription on the sarcophagus of Ashmunazar on the other. But the camel was not used in Crete, probably was not known there, consequently the sign was modified into the likeness of a human leg. That this is not the primitive form is clear from the fact that while in the primitive Semitic form the approximately horizontal portion of the figure is markedly shorter, suggesting the proportion of the relative lengths of the camel's head and neck, a proportion lost in later examples, in the Minoan the horizontal is practically equal in length to the perpendicular (*Scripta Minoa*, p. 87). The Cretan epigraphist knowing nothing of camels developed the shape into a closer likeness to an object with which he was acquainted, a human leg. A similar process is seen in the initial letters of the chapters of an illustrated book, in which the shape of the letter is altered and metamorphosed to illustrate the contents of the coming portion of the book.

Another example of what appears a similar process of modification is to be found in regard to the letter *zain* which in Minoan appears as a two-edged battle-axe. The meaning of the word seems to be a "weapon," and this symbol would suit that meaning. The earliest form of this letter in Semitic is which occurs on the Ba'al-Lebanon inscription; this could not conceivably be developed from the Minoan form. But on the other hand, when the successive forms this letter assumes are followed, the possibility of the Minoan symbol being evolved from the Semitic is clear. The Ba'al-Lebanon figure appears to be a conventionalised representation of a dart, barbed and feathered; on the Moabite stone it becomes and in the Siloam inscription . Later still as on the sarcophagus of Ashmunazar the shape is reached clearly from the desire to write the form quickly; and from this the Minoan is readily developed.

In the letter *teth* Evans sees a distinct case of the Minoan character being clearly the primitive. It certainly is the case that there is nothing like a consensus of opinion

as to either the meaning of the name or of the object intended to be indicated. Gesenius suggested a "serpent," for which he adduces an Arabic root now unused. The earliest shape the letter assumes, a cross surrounded by a circle, does not at all support this view. Various other objects have been suggested as the hieroglyph behind this letter, but without any striking probability in their favour. The resemblance to a chariot wheel, the form the letter assumes in Minoan, is very seductive. It has to be observed, however, that the pictograph is in every case developed beyond the mere suggestive outline used in true alphabetic symbols. In short, it appears to be a case parallel with that of *gimel*, an effort to give a meaning to a symbol which was otherwise unintelligible. If the contention which we maintain elsewhere is correct, that the invention of the alphabet is to be put to the credit of a tribe of trading Aramæans having their headquarters in the valley of the Tigris and the Euphrates, then *teth* might be a word in use only among them and significant of some object with which they, though not their Hebrew and Phœnician customers, were familiar. It is possible that similar has been the history of *qoph* which by general consent is received to mean "the back of the head"; the word may have had that meaning to the Aramæan inventors of the alphabet. There is no extant word in any Semitic language having that meaning. In Hebrew *qoph* means "a monkey with a tail"; some of the forms the letter assumes have a not very distant resemblance to a view in profile of a monkey seated on a branch with its tail hanging down. Were it found that in Crete a word, nearly akin to the name of this letter, meant either the back of the head or, as Sir Arthur Evans suggests, the face without the features, something might be said for the Minoan origin of the Semitic alphabet. Certainly in the Aryan tongues the word for head has a superficial resemblance to this, as seen in the Latin *caput* and the German *kopf;* but the initial sound is quite distinct from the *k* sound, one very difficult to pronounce, as exhibited by the fact that in a great part of the nearer East it has disappeared from pronunciation, being replaced by the *hemza.* In some quarters it is pronounced as *g*, a sound that has been lost by the *gimel* in Syrian Arabic. The Greeks did not retain it in their alphabet, although its presence as a numeral proves that the Hellenic alphabet had it originally. It is not impossible that some Aramaic inscription may supply the missing word.

If the Cretans in their alphabetic symbols depicted the same objects and gave them the same names as did the Phœnicians, then they too must have been Semites. But Herodotus reckons them Hellenes (Herod. i. 2). In Homer, Idomeneus, the Cretan king, grandson of Minos, is prominent among the Greeks in the Trojan War (ii. xiii. 439, etc.). If, while the objects depicted in the Cretan alphabet were the same as those in the Phœnician, the names were different, yet in each case the initial sound was the same, the phenomena would certainly be explained. Only such a fortuitous coincidence is so highly improbable as to amount to an impossibility.

The connection of the Hellenic alphabet with that of Phœnicia is exhibited in another way. It is probable from the close connection between Northern Israel and Phœnicia that the latter would share with the former its incapacity to pronounce the gutturals. It is evident that whoever gave the Greeks the alphabet they must have laboured under this disability. Hence the Greeks proceeded to use the signs for the unpronounced gutturals for the vowels with which they were most frequently united; thus *alpha* became the vowel *a*, and *he* became the vowel *e* and so on. Though the alphabet introduced among the Greeks had no gutturals, the Hellenic tongue had them in use, so they had to devise means of indicating them; hence the sound which *he* had in the earlier Semitic tongue and in Hebrew was represented by the "rough breathing," and for *heth* the letter χ had to be introduced.

We do not know if the Cretans laboured under the same disability in regard to the gutturals as did the Phœnicians. If they did not, then the Greeks did not get their alphabet from them. If they did then they, no more than the Phœnicians, could be the inventors of the alphabet. They would not have invented symbols for sounds which they did possess.

There are, further, other letters which appear at one time to have been in the Greek alphabet, but which disappeared only a little while before historic time. The sixth letter had disappeared from the alphabet of classic Greek, possibly because it represented a sound which was not used by the Hellenes.

If *vav* was pronounced, as was not improbably the case, as *w*, and the ancient Greeks, like their modern representatives, had not that sound, the disappearance of that letter from the alphabet of writing, although its place was still

retained when the alphabet was used numerically, was a not unnatural result. Metrical considerations have rendered it not improbable that the *digamma*, as it was called from its form, was in use when the Homeric poems were composed. Hence the necessity felt for introducing *φ phi* and *v upsilon* to represent the *f* and *v* sounds. In the case of the first of these letters, it as is well known has retained in the Latin language the place it had originally in the Semitic alphabet, and through it, occupies that position in the languages of Western Europe.[1] As to the latter letter it has to be observed that in modern Greek *upsilon* is generally pronounced as *v*; thus the word for "cross," while written as it is in ancient Greek, is pronounced *stavros*. That the transliteration into Latin of the Greek for "gospel" assumes the form *evangelium*, and that for "preparation" becomes *parasceva*, proves that at least in certain combinations *upsilon* was pronounced *v* by the Greeks of the opening centuries of our era. In passing, it may be observed that the differences between the Greek and Latin alphabets, taken along with the predominant resemblances between them, indicates that though both have been borrowed from the same source, each has received it independently.

We have elsewhere maintained that the Semitic alphabet could not have been invented by the Phœnicians. The arguments which led us to that conclusion apply equally against the idea that it originated among the Cretans. The Cretans, like the Phœnicians, were a maritime people; indeed as inhabiting an island they could not pretend to an imperial position in any other way than by developing their seafaring industry. That being the case it might have been expected that the objects used to supply alphabetic symbols would have been, to some extent at any rate, drawn from the utensils of maritime industry. But neither in Crete nor in Phœnicia have any of the alphabetic signs such a source. It is not that things belonging to seafaring life could not be conventionalised. Conventionalised sails are not infrequent in Egyptian hieroglyph, and ships are found delineated in the Minoan inscriptions, but they do not seem to have served as signs of sounds. The Cretans must have had words for "ships," "sails," "anchors," "oars," "helms," "rudders," and so forth; why were not some of these

[1] It may be observed that the form alike of the *digamma* and of the Latin F is really that of the Samaritan *vav* turned to look from left to right, instead of from right to left.

used to serve as the alphabetic sign to denote their initial sound? It can only have been that they had received the alphabet from an external source, the invention of a people partly agricultural and partly nomadic, who used camels and tents, but were acquainted with more stationary modes of life. If they know nothing of the great sea, they know about fish and fishing. Everything points to the inventors being a nomadic Aramæan tribe, whose home was on the Mesopotamian border of the desert which separated the land of the two rivers from Western Syria, and who were engaged in conveying merchandise from Babylonia to the shores of the Mediterranean.

We therefore, for the above reasons, venture to maintain that Sir Arthur Evans has failed to make good his contention that the Semitic alphabet has been originated by the Cretans; indeed we shall go as far as to say that he has not even made his case plausible. Despite the weight of his authority, we feel that the balance of evidence is in favour of the conclusion above stated.

APPENDIX IV

NAVILLE'S THEORY OF THE ORIGINAL LANGUAGE OF THE OLD TESTAMENT

THE science of Biblical archæology owes so great a debt to Professor Naville that even when we differ from him we do so with reluctance, and with a deference which would lead us to place the most favourable construction on any view which he may propound. His identification of the "store cities" built by the Israelites under the "taskmasters" of the Pharaoh of the oppression, has been very generally accepted. If his brilliant suggestion that the copy of the Law found in the days of Josiah, during the repair of the temple, was that which, in accordance with the Egyptian custom of placing in the foundation of their temples a portion of the Book of the Dead, Solomon had placed at the foundation of the Jerusalem temple, has not been received with similar respect, nor indeed been seriously discussed, the reason of this may be sought in the dominance of the Wellhausen hypothesis. If it was a copy of the whole Law which had been so placed and so found, Ezra had no more to do with the Priestly Code than Wellhausen himself. If it were only the book of Deuteronomy, as Naville thinks, still the whole theory is so involved in maintaining the book in question to have been a forgery contemporary with its discovery, that it would be shaken to its foundations. It will be readily seen that it is from no lack of respect for Dr Naville, or for what he has done in Egyptology, and for Biblical archæology by means of it, that we are not prepared to accept his theory as to the original language of the Old Testament, as propounded first in his book on Biblical archæology, and later in his *Schweich Lectures*.

His theory is that the Pentateuch was originally written in cuneiform, and therefore on clay tablets. He thinks that Abraham brought with him from Padan-Aram a number of those containing the stories of Creation, the Flood, the

building of Babel, etc., and that tribal scribes continued in Palestine the process of recording events on clay tablets. When they went down to Egypt the patriarchs carried these tablets with them. These would all be written not only in cuneiform character but also in the language of Mesopotamia. Moses, as learned in all the learning of the Egyptians, would necessarily be acquainted with Assyrian, the language of diplomacy. In his intercourse with his own people he would come to know about those tablets, and would arrange them in a succession fitted to bring out the special position of privilege occupied by Israel. Records thus preserved on tablets would not be continuous, each would be a separate unit with probably an introduction, which would recapitulate something of what might be on other tablets and have a concluding formula. Dr Naville holds that Moses recorded on similar tablets the subsequent history in which he was the principal actor, and also his legislation. Deuteronomy would form a group of tablets apart. With the accession of Solomon was introduced into Palestine the Phœnician script which, however, was not used for the Law; it was always transcribed in cuneiform and in the Assyrian or Babylonian tongue. When Ezra came he translated the Law into Aramaic, and wrote it out in the Aramæan script. Later Rabbin translated the Law from the Aramaic of Ezra into Hebrew, or as Naville would prefer to call it, *Yehudith*, "Jewish," which he regards not as a language distinct from Aramaic but only as a patois, differing from it merely as "Platt-Deutsch" differs from the German of Luther or Schiller. As to the other and later books he believes that some would be impressed on clay tablets, and others scratched on potsherds or written on parchment or papyrus. The script used, he thinks, would not be the Canaanite but the Aramæan; this name he restricts to the script of the Assouan papyri.

Portions of this theory are worthy not only of consideration but of general acceptance. Brought up as Abraham was in a state so advanced in civilisation as was that of Ḥammurabi, in which scribes were a class important enough to require special legislation, he could not fail to value writing; nomad as he was if he could not write himself, though that he should have that accomplishment is not unlikely, he would yet have among his clansmen one or more capable of exercising this art. Hence that the legends of the Creation and the Flood would be impressed for him on clay tablets, and conveyed by him to Palestine is extremely likely. No one who was not "thirl" to the critical hypothesis

would fail to see that the Jewish form of these stories is much more primitive than the Babylonian. Thus to take the story of the Flood; in the Babylonian form of the legend Par-Nipishtim brings into the Ark with him not only silver and gold but also slaves, whereas Noah in the Bible narrative takes with him none of these, does not indeed seem to have them. The Bible narrative dates from a period before men had begun to use metals generally or to possess slaves. The clay tablets which Abraham brought with him may well represent the source of the Bible story. A difficulty suggests itself at this point; the language of Babylonia at that time was not written in a script that could be called in any strict sense cuneiform. The Laws of Ḥammurabi were incised in a script which has only a very distant resemblance to the cuneiform of the times of the Sargonids. When it was impressed on bricks, the figures of the characters were not made by fine chisels but by a block of wood or stone on which the inscription had been cut in relief, being pressed on the soft wet clay. This may be seen from the multitude of bricks from the temple mounds of Mugheir (Ur of the Chaldees) on which there are identical inscriptions.

Further, it may be doubted whether the herdsmen of Abraham and Isaac would retain the language of Babylon, when in Canaan they were associating with their neighbours who spoke a different tongue. It is quite true that diplomatic correspondence some centuries later was carried on even with Egypt in the language and script of Babylon. In that case there is evidence, as Professor Naville himself informs us, that the native tongue of the writers was different from that in which they wrote. Unless when writing legal documents, or diplomatic letters, the inhabitants would write in their own tongue. As to the script, the want of the fine clay would be a great, almost an insuperable difficulty in using the cuneiform for ordinary correspondence. About a century ago among ourselves parchment was, while still used for legal deeds, never taken for ordinary letters. Clay might be imported for the use of diplomats or legal scribes, but natives in their letters would content themselves with the writing material within reach. It is doubtful if the followers of Abraham would reckon the annals of their wanderings to be worthy the expensive imported clay. Still less would the Mesopotamian clay be available in the wilderness. The "Ten Words" were engraved on tables of stone, and therefore not on a material favourable to cuneiform. Still as cuneiform inscriptions were incised on the

gypsum slabs of the palaces of Sargon at Khorsabad, and of Sennacherib at Kuyounjik, the granite of Sinai might be engraved with cuneiform symbols.

Before passing on to consider this theory further a note may be inserted at this point, by way of caveat, against accepting the assumption which Professor Naville makes, that Assyrian was so like the language of Canaan that Abraham and his herdsmen would have no difficulty from the very first in conversing with the natives. To prove that although both Assyrian and Hebrew, which is admitted to be the same as Phœnician, belong to the same class of Semitic languages but are yet very different from each other, one has only to turn into Hebrew any few lines of the examples given in King's *First Steps in Assyrian*. Communication between the men of Abraham and the Canaanites would be mainly through generally recognised signs; a method of intercourse to some extent in use in Palestine to this day.

Closely akin to this assumption is the idea that the literary language of South-Western Asia was Assyrian. Dr Naville grounds this on the fact that while numerous clay tablets emanating from Palestine have come down to the present day, nothing survives in any other script or language. The *argumentum e silentio* is notoriously inconclusive. It is doubly so in the present case when the difference in durability is considered between the tablets of kiln-burned clay and sheets of brittle papyrus, or skins liable to decay, the only materials for writing on available to the Palestinian in ordinary cases. It is quite true that diplomatic correspondence and legal documents were written in the script and language of Babylon, a relic of the far back conquest; but from that it cannot be argued that there was no indigenous literature. For centuries after Norman-French ceased to be spoken in England, Acts of Parliament and certain legal deeds were inscribed in that tongue. One may not argue from this that neither Chaucer nor Wiclif lived or wrote in English. Although no fragments of literature have been preserved on contemporary parchment or papyrus, yet the form of the letters in the inscription of Mesha of Moab proves that a long process of evolution from pictograph lay behind; this in turn implies much practice in writing. The style of the composition also indicates that the author of the inscription was not unaccustomed to writing narrative. This is confirmed by the Siloam inscription, the composition not of a court-historiographer, as that of the Moabite Stone

probably was, but of the foreman of the excavators employed by Hezekiah.

As evidence of the correctness of his hypothesis that the Pentateuch was written on clay tablets with cuneiform characters and in the Babylonian tongue, Professor Naville adduces the phrase which recurs so frequently in Genesis, "The Book of the Generations of, etc.," which he regards as the terminal formula of a tablet. But this phrase is restricted to Genesis alone of the books of the Law; and not even in that book does it occur with sufficient frequency to justify his conclusion. Again, while the phrase in question appears occasionally at the end of portions of the book of a length to suggest transcription from a tablet, *e.g.* Gen. ii. 4, on the other hand there are cases where the formula must have been at the beginning not the end of the paragraph, *e.g.* chap. xxxvi. 1, 9; xxxvii. 2; it may further be observed that the paragraphs in chap. xxxvi. are out of proportion short to be the transcription of narrative tablets. Many of the narratives in Genesis suggest by their form that to some extent they had been transmitted as oral traditions.

In regard to the later books Dr Naville thinks that they were sometimes impressed with chisels on clay tablets, and at others scratched on stone or metal plates. This double usage he thinks is implied in the account of the naming of Maher-shalal-hash-baz (Is. viii. 1). Naville recognises that in this instance we have a case of engraving on a stone tablet or metal plate, but thinks that when Isaiah speaks of "a man's pen" he means to distinguish between the ordinary writing which he is to employ in this case, and the legal script which it might have been supposed would have been used. This view, while not in itself improbable, really implies nothing as to how the rest of the prophecies of Isaiah were written. That certain legal documents were a century ago usually written in "blackletter" is no proof that people wrote treatises in that script, or that books were printed in it. Even of less probative value is the fact that in Gezer two contract tablets in cuneiform have been found dated 649 and 647 B.C. respectively. At that time Palestine formed part of the Assyrian Empire; and so the diminished kingdom of Judah whose king Manasseh was then a captive in Babylon had been conquered by Esarhaddon. It was not extraordinary that legal contracts should be written in the language of the suzerain power; but this fact would give no information as to what literary activity there was among the natives, or in what language it found expression. Another

script was in use in Gezer; stones have been found with the words engraved on them *Tahoum Gezer*, "the boundary of Gezer." The language is Aramaic, and the characters are what Dr Naville calls Phœnician. Aramaic was the second official tongue of the Assyrian Empire; much as in Ireland four or five centuries ago, for certain government documents, Norman-French was the language employed, in others English, while the language of the people was Erse. An outsider might argue that English was the literary language of Ireland; Shakespeare, it might be shown, represents Macmorris the Irish captain in the army of Henry V. as speaking English. From this it might be maintained that the language of the Irish in Shakespeare's days was English; all the more so that he makes Frenchmen in that play speak French. Reference might be made to those masters of English—Swift, Burke, Goldsmith, Sheridan, Moore, and hosts of others, all Irishmen. Yet there was all the while the splendid Celtic literature, the value of which we are only now beginning to estimate, dating from before the English Conquest altogether. Dr Naville, it seems to us, has been guilty of a similarly erroneous judgment to that which we have attributed to the above supposed outsider.

Another point in the hypothesis advocated by Professor Naville is the relation in which he assumes Hebrew to stand to Aramaic; he regards the former as being merely a patois of the latter. The request which Eliakim and those with him made to Rabshakeh (2 Kings xviii. 26) appears to imply that as "the people on the wall" would not understand a speech delivered in Aramaic, it was a *language* different from that which they ordinarily spoke. The Scottish dialect is regarded as quite distinct from literary English; yet Gladstone had no difficulty, though speaking in literary English, in rousing the Scottish people in his Midlothian campaign to the utmost enthusiasm. Notwithstanding, Professor Naville thinks the request of Eliakim quite compatible with Hebrew being merely a patois of Aramaic. It surely is not to be imagined that only the ignorant rabble of Jerusalem crowded to the city wall when the representatives of Hezekiah had their conference with the Chancellor of the great king, the King of Assyria.

This subject may be approached from another point. It may be admitted that it is difficult to determine precisely the amount of difference which must be proved to exist between two modes of speech, before it may be considered clear that they are different languages and not merely

different dialects of the same language. Further, it is obvious that the difficulty in the case before us is increased by the fact that the different languages of the Semitic group resemble each other so closely in their vocabulary and their grammatical accidence. Still bearing all things in mind, it seems impossible to maintain that the differences which separate Hebrew from Aramaic are merely dialectic. In the first place, both languages have syntactical peculiarities which not only distinguish them from each other but from all other Semitic tongues. On the one hand, in regard to Hebrew, there is "the *vav* conversive"; the strange idiom by which the simple conjunction *u* or *ve* when preceding the preterite of a verb makes it future, but when it precedes a future makes it have a past sense. This peculiarity the Aramaic does not share, as indeed does no other language Semitic or other. On the other hand, Aramaic has a distinguishing characteristic which marks it off from Hebrew, as also from other Semitic languages. Instead of the definite article the Aramaic has the *status emphaticus;* the syllable *ah* or *a* is added to any substantive which is to be made definite. This syllable is affixed in accordance with the same rules as regulate the prefixing of the article *ha* in Hebrew. Although in regard to accidence there is less difference, still even there the distinguishing peculiarities are marked. In conjugation the verb in both languages conforms to the Semitic type, yet the Aramaic is much more simple and symmetrical in the arrangement of its "conjugations" or verbal forms. In Aramaic these are alternately active and passive; the latter being distinguished from the former by having the syllable *ith* or *eth* prefixed. In Hebrew the difference is mainly indicated by an internal *vocalic* change as Piel becomes Pual in the passive, and Hiphil, Hophal; the passive of the *Qal* is formed by prefixing the syllable *ni*. The preformative *hith*, analogous to the *ith* and *eth* of Aramaic, is the sign not of the passive but of the reflexive in Hebrew. If Hebrew is compared with Eastern Aramaic a further difference emerges; the preformative of 3rd per. masc. sing. and plur. impf. is *nun*, not as in all other Semitic languages, including Western Aramaic, *yodh*.[1]

It may be added that while the Phœnician dialect of Hebrew seems to agree in regard to its conjugations with that of Jerusalem, the dialect of Moab seems to have had a

[1] In regard to the substantive verb the preformative is sometimes *lamed*, as in the Mandæan subdialect of Eastern Aramaic and in the Aramaic of the Bible.

more elaborate system akin to the Arabic. When the above considerations are taken into account, it would appear to be impossible to agree to Dr Naville's view and regard Hebrew as simply a patois of Aramaic. The difference is greater than that which separates French from Italian, or Spanish from Portuguese; surely Dr Naville would not consider Portuguese a patois of Spanish, or French of Italian.

This leads to consideration of another point in Professor Naville's theory of the evolution of the present text of the Old Testament. According to his hypothesis Ezra not only translated the Law out of Babylonian into Aramaic but committed his translation to writing in the Aramaic script of Assouan. It is difficult to understand why Dr Naville has thought it at all probable that Ezra, who presumably was acquainted with the Aramaic script in use all over Syria, found alike in the inscriptions in Sinjirli, on the weights in the palace of Sargon in Nineveh, and on the envelopes of the contract tablets of Babylon, would so go out of his way to use the script of Assouan in preference. In the greater portion of the text both of his *Schweich Lectures*, and of his book on Biblical archæology, Professor Naville speaks as if the Aramæans wrote their language only in the mode of writing adopted by the Jews of Assouan to suit the writing materials open to them in Egypt. There is no evidence that when the Jews of Palestine and the Phœnicians wrote Aramaic they did not use the characters used by the Aramæans around them. That scribes both in Jerusalem and in Samaria would be able to decipher writings sent them from Assouan is probable enough, but from this it does not follow that when writing, not on papyrus but on parchment, they would use any other script than that which he calls Phœnician, but which was really the universal Semite script. Ezra it may be presumed would write in Jerusalem, as he had been accustomed to do in Babylon, with the characters of ordinary Semitic. It seems to us that Dr Naville has encumbered his theory unnecessarily with this additional hypothesis that Ezra employed the script of Assouan.

The further portion of Dr Naville's theory that Ezra not only transcribed the Torah into Aramaic script but translated it into the Aramaic language involves a singular reversal of the age-old opinion that the Aramaic Targums were interpretations of the Law rendered necessary by the fact that the Jews had largely abandoned Hebrew. According to Professor Naville's theory, the Aramaic was the original and the Hebrew which has been so long regarded as

the original was really the Targum, the interpretation. His presupposed history of the extant Hebrew text is a daring hypothesis. Certain of the Jerusalem Rabbin translated from Ezra's Aramaic successively the Law, the Prophets, and the *K'thubhim* into the local patois of Judea. The theory in question is so bizarre that in order to ensure ourselves against misrepresenting it the very words in which it is propounded must be given. "When the Rabbis wished to give to their religion, to their laws, to their national life which rests entirely on their books, a thoroughly and exclusively Jewish character, they made a dialectal modification; they turned their books into the language spoken at Jerusalem; but since that had no script, they had to invent one, and they adopted a modified form not of the Canaanite but of the Aramaic, the one real book-language which they already knew" (*Archæology of the Old Testament*, p. 207). Another feature in this hypothetical history may be drawn from the *Schweich Lectures:* "As it came out of Ezra's hand, this law, their sacred books, had no national garb, it was only a part of the Aramaic literature. It was necessary to separate the books of Moses and the Prophets from foreign writings, so that they should become exclusively Jewish. The hated Samaritans had that privilege, they could not be confused with the Jews or with their other neighbours, since they had their Pentateuch written in their own script and in their own dialect, which differed but little from that of the Jews. I believe the Rabbis did the same as the Samaritans" (*Schweich Lectures*, p. 76). There are three points here: (1) The present Hebrew Scriptures are a translation from Aramaic; (2) The present Hebrew character is the invention of the Jewish Rabbis, a modification of the script of the Assouan papyri; (3) That this double process was carried out in imitation of the "hated" Samaritans.

To take these points *seriatim*:—(1) The extant Hebrew Scriptures are a translation from the Aramaic. There are already the well-known Targums, to restrict attention to the Torah, the Targums of Onkelos, and of Jonathan ben Uzziel, so-called, besides the variation of the latter, the Targum of Jerusalem. Professor Naville has only indicated in the most indefinite manner the period when he thinks the Jerusalem Rabbin made their translation from Ezra's Aramaic. As, however, he holds that Our Lord delivered His discourses in Aramaic, and notes that He quotes the twenty-second Psalm in Aramaic while hanging on the cross, as evidence "that the sacred books must all have been in

Aramaic," it would seem that he holds that the Rabbinic translation was made after the fall of Jerusalem. The ordinarily received date of Onkelos is early in the third century of our era; Stenning (*Enc. Brit.*, "Targum") would place it a century later. It evidently is the traditional version handed down from *meturgeman* to *meturgeman;* it has greater affinities with the Biblical Aramaic than with the Aramaic of the Talmud, or the Aramaic of the Palestinian Lectionary. Does Dr Naville maintain that the so-called Targum of Onkelos is really Ezra's version of the original Mosaic cuneiform? If the Rabbinic Hebrew was introduced in the beginning of the second century A.D., surely every copy of Ezra's version would not have disappeared by then. If it was still extant, there would be no need of another Aramaic version. Consequently it would seem that Professor Naville is obliged to assert the Targum of Onkelos to be really the version which Ezra made from the cuneiform tablets left by Moses. Hence the present Hebrew text of the Pentateuch is a translation of the Targum. It would seem to be an investigation by no means involving abnormal ability or information to demonstrate which, the Targum of Onkelos or the Massoretic Hebrew, was the original and which the version. Every student of Hebrew knows אֵת *eth* the sign of the accusative. When the student passes to Aramaic he finds that יָת *yath* occupies the same position in Onkelos, as also in the Peshitta, that is to say whenever *eth* appears in the Hebrew then *yath* appears in the Aramaic, Eastern or Western. When, however, the student directs his attention to writings composed in Aramaic he finds this particle practically absent. In Biblical Aramaic it occurs only in Dan. iii. 12, and then only as supporting the oblique case of a pronoun; in the Sinjirli inscriptions the equivalent particle וָת *vath* occurs only once and in a similar grammatical construction (Sinjirli Hadad, 28). In translations made from Greek which has no such particle יָת *yath* is not found, as may be seen by reading the Peshitta New Testament and the Palestinian Lectionary. When one compares either the Targum of Onkelos or the Peshitta with the Hebrew text, it is at once seen that *yath* occurs always and only when *eth* is found in the Hebrew; just as Aquila represents the untranslatable particle by συν in his version. It would seem that Aramaic had this particle originally, but it had fallen into disuse as far back as the eighth century B.C.; and it was revived in the Targum much as the antique forms of the Authorised Version were used in the translation of the

Bensly fragment of 2 Esdras when it was inserted in the text of the Revised Version of the Apocrypha. Other instances might be brought in which the Aramaic is conformed to the Hebrew, but what we have referred to is patent to every reader. Confirmatory of the originality of the Hebrew is the treatment of poetical passages in the Targum. Wherever there is obscurity in the Hebrew there is the endeavour to remove the obscurity in the Targum. In Gen. iv. 7, we have in the Hebrew the difficult sentence rendered in the Revised: "If thou doest well shalt thou not be accepted? and if thou doest not well sin coucheth at the door; and unto thee shall be his desire, and thou shalt rule over him." This is without doubt very obscure. Onkelos renders thus according to Etheridge's translation: "If thou doest thy work well is it not remitted to thee? and if thou doest thy work not well, thy sin unto the day of judgment is reserved, when it will be exacted of thee, if thou convert not: but if thou convert, it is remitted to thee." It goes without saying that the Targum is the simpler: while by no possibility can the Hebrew be regarded as an attempt to render the Aramaic; the Aramaic is a paraphrase of the Hebrew taking the word for "sin" as meaning "sin-offering," and interpreting the enigmatic last clause as implying that Cain would not lose his birthright as elder brother. A yet more striking instance is found in the fifteenth verse of the preceding chapter: "I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed: it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel." The version of the Targum is clearly an attempt to explain the Hebrew: in no way can the Hebrew be regarded as an attempt to give a rendering of the Aramaic. It is as follows: "I will put emnity between thee and between the woman, and between thy son and her son. He will remember thee what thou didst to him at the beginning, and thou shalt be observant unto him at the end." No one can doubt that of these two the Hebrew, not the Aramaic, is the original; the Hebrew is figurative and poetic, the Aramaic is plain prose; that a translator may turn poetry into prose is what is not infrequently seen, but that prose in the original should become poetry in the version is an unknown phenomenon in the history of literature. There are numerous other passages in Onkelos exhibiting the same characteristics.

The assertion (2) that the modern Hebrew character is the invention of the Jewish Rabbin, a modification of the script of Assouan need not occupy much time as it is

supported by no proof; what resemblance there is, is due to the fact that both scripts resulted from writing with a reed pen on papyrus. The Greek transcription of the *tetragrammaton* shows that in early Christian times *vav* and *yodh* were as indistinguishable in the script then in use among the Jews as they are in the Kefr Bir'im inscription. In the script of Assouan, on the other hand, these two letters are not by any means strikingly like each other. The present square character was the result of independent evolution. Had Professor Naville's theory been correct, the Septuagint would have been translated from a text written in the Aramaic script of Assouan, and variations of the LXX. from the Massoretic would have been shown mainly to have been due to mistakes of letters like in that script; but differences attributable to this cause have not been numerous enough to attract attention. On the other hand, Professor Kohn rested part of the proof of his Thesis, that the LXX. translated from the Samaritan Recension, on the fact that some of the variations could be explained by confusions of letters like each other in the Samaritan script. Origen's interpretation of the "tittle" in Matt. v. 18, proves that the square character was in use in the third century of our era; this leaves but little time for the process Professor Naville's theory presupposes. This second point may be dismissed as unproved and improbable.

The remaining point (3) is that this translation from Aramaic into Hebrew was made in imitation of the Samaritans. The most rudimentary knowledge of the period in which this alleged translation was produced would make the inquirer aware of the hatred and contempt with which the Jews regarded their Northern co-religionists. In the Talmud they are spoken of as "Cuthæans," and sometimes as "the foolish people of Shechem." That the despised "Cuthæans" had translated the original Aramaic of the Scriptures into Hebrew would, one should have thought, have afforded the Jerusalem Rabbin an opportunity of denouncing the "Cuthæans" as guilty of another enormity, rather than to suggest to them a thing which they themselves ought to follow. But the very assumption that before the Jews, the Samaritans had rendered the cuneiform inscriptions which contained the sacred Torah into Aramaic, and further turned that Aramaic into "the local patois of Jerusalem" is itself improbable. These assumptions involve difficulties which in their very nature appear to us insuperable. It is true that like the Jews the Samaritans have an

Aramaic Targum of the Law. Who made this Aramaic version of Pentateuch? Certainly it could not be Ezra. If Onkelos represents the original Aramaic of Ezra, the most casual inspection of the Samaritan Targum reveals the differences which separate these two. The Samaritan is written in a different dialect of Aramaic, one which has closer affinities to Hebrew. Further it has to be noted that the Samaritan Targum is much closer to the Hebrew than is that of Onkelos. This may be seen by comparing the curse on the serpent from Onkelos as given above with the Samaritan version: "I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed; he shall bruise thee as to the head, and thou shalt bruise him as to the heel." Comparison may also be made with the Divine exhortation to Cain as found in Onkelos and given above with the Samaritan, which is as follows: "If thou doest well thou shalt be accepted, if thou doest not well, sin croucheth at the door and to thy hand is repentance (Castelli *conversio*), and thou shalt rule over him." If for the moment we accept Professor Naville's hypothesis, it may be admitted that the translation of these passages into Hebrew would result in something very like the Massoretic. As above shown any attempt to render the Onkelos version of these passages into Hebrew would result in something very different from the received text.

This brings us to what appears to be the crowning difficulty of accepting Dr Naville's theory. Is it conceivable on the ordinary doctrine of probabilities that from two such widely differing Aramaic versions a Hebrew text should emerge which is practically identical, the same in Samaria as in Jerusalem? Even if the improbable supposition is assumed that Ezra's Aramaic version as well as the original Samaritan Aramaic have both utterly disappeared, and so the present Targums are not those from which the Hebrew version has been made, still it must be maintained as amounting almost to an impossibility that two independent versions in Aramaic, versions of the assumed cuneiform text, should be so closely alike that when independently translated into Hebrew the two versions were all but absolutely identical.

After considering Professor Naville's theory in the most favourable way, admitting to the utmost every probability which can be urged in its favour, we are compelled to conclude that it is not worthy of acceptance.

INDEX

A

Abbaside persecution of the Samaritans, 48
Aboda Zara quoted, 38
Abu'l Fath, Chronicle of, described, 147-8
  hymn on sufferings of Samaritans, 267-8
  on cause of Samaritan rebellion under Zeno, 45
  on Christ's birth and life, 165
  on Christ's disciples and apostles, 165-6
  on date when sacrifices ceased on Mount Gerizim, 120
  on identity of the Essenes and Samaritans, 164
Addis, Dr, on Hezekiah's destruction of the High Places, 372
Adler, the Samaritan Chronicle and its publication, 148-9
  the Samaritan Chronicle, analysis of, 155-9
  concealment of the Sacred Roll of the Law, 161
Alexander the Great, his intended desecration of Mount Gerizim averted by the influence of Hizqiah the High Priest, 163
  story of his destruction of Samaria criticised, 31
Alexander, son of Aristobulus, defeated by Gabinius, 37
Alexander Jannæus and his widow held Samaria as part of their dominions, 35
Alexandria, Jewish influence in the city of, 319
  use of Hebrew by Jews discontinued there, 320
Alexandrian Version of Pentateuch, peculiarities of, 341-2
Alphabet, the, evolved from hieroglyphics in Babylon and Egypt, 204-5
  the tables of, in Semitic script, 222
  the Semitic, its relation to the Minoan alphabet, Appendix, 404-11
  Phœnician origin of the Greek, 233
  regularity of the order of the letters in the, and the importance of its fixity in connection with cryptic writing, 218
Alphabetic poems in Hebrew literature, 217-18
  in Samaritan, 266
Amos, his references to ritual worship in Northern Israel, 78-9
  his use of technical ritual terms, 80
Anastasius, Samaritan rebellion in time of, 45
Angels, the doctrine of, whence derived, 74-5
  Samaritan belief in, 187
Antagonism between the worship of JHWH in Northern Israel and on Mount Zion considered, 352
Antediluvians, the genealogy of, in Samaritan Pentateuch reviewed, 344
Antiochus Epiphanes, treatment of the Jews by, 33
Antiochus the Great, treatment of Samaritans by, 32

Antonines, the, destruction of Samaritan literature under, 260
the review of Samaritan history under, 41, 169, 260
Apocalyptists, the, their doctrine of God as localised and visible, 179
Apollonius has Samaritans in his army, 34
Aqabiah, concealment of vessels of the Tabernacle, 160
Aramaic, Biblical, compared with Samaritan, 246-51
abandoned by Jews in Egypt, especially in Alexandria, 320
gradual introduction of, into Palestine by Assyrian colonists, 256-7
unknown in Southern Israel in time of Sennacherib, 256
Aristeas, on the origin of the Septuagint, 320
Artaxerxes, ordered sacrifices to be offered on Mount Gerizim, but these forbidden, 162
Ashima, Jews assert that the Samaritans worship, 178
Ashmunazar, the inscription on his sarcophagus, 224
Askenazim, use of synagogues as a sort of club by the, 122
Assouan papyri, their confirmation of Biblical history, 29
Assyrian deportations, their design, 17-20
Astruc, his hypothesis of the existence of two documents in the books of Genesis and Exodus stated, 358-9
relation of his hypothesis to modern Biblical criticism, 358-9
Atonement, description of the Great Day of, as it is observed by the Samaritans, 134
the Great Day of, the Jewish and Samaritan modes of its observance reviewed and contrasted, 134-5

B

Baal, the name as a factor in Israelitish nomenclature, its significance, 378-9
the name of the Supreme God of the Canaanites, 63
Baal, the name of local deities, 63
Baal-worship, its influence on Israel, 63
Baalim, impure rites in worship of the, 64-5
Baasha adopts measures to prevent the Northern Israelites worshipping in Jerusalem, 82
Babylonian story of the Creation, 185
Bagster, list of variants between Samaritan and Massoretic texts, 279-82
Bar-Cochba, war of, in Samaritan history, 167
Bashan, province of, held by the kingdom of Syria, 3
Benjamin of Tudela, his account of the Samaritans in twelfth century, 49-50, 120
Bennet, ascribes the first two verses of Joshua to E, although JHWH only divine name used, 359
Book of the Dead, portions of, placed in foundation of Egyptian temples, 375
Booths, in connection with Feast of Tabernacles, mentioned in Leviticus and Deuteronomy, 374
Budge, Dr Wallis, on Egyptian religion, 64
Burial of the dead, practice of Samaritans at, 139
Burney, Dr, on narrative of Hezekiah's destruction of the High Places, 372
Buxtorf, Dr, on recency of the Samaritan Pentateuch, 276
asserts Pentateuch written in square characters, 276

C

Calves, golden, the worship of, considered, 71-2
worship of, how rendered, 76-7
kissing of, explained, 77
Canaanite cities described, 61-2
aboriginal tribes, corrupting influence of, 62-3
Carmina Samaritana, Gesenius on, 266-7
Cerealis slaughters Samaritans in the time of Vespasian, 39

Cheyne, Dr, referred to, 365, note, on Simon the Just
Chinese language, the only ideographic tongue, 203-4
Christ, Samaritan account of, 165
Christian influence on Samaritan religion, 192
Chronicles, books of, dates and historical value considered, 106-7, note
Chronology of Josephus proved to be inaccurate, 30
Circumcision, as observed by Samaritans, 137
contrast between Jewish and Samaritan rites, 137-8
Cities of the Plain, significance of the prophetic reference to their destruction, 95-6
Coffins, use of, a peculiarity of the Samaritans, 140
Colonists deported from Northern Israel, who were they? 20-2
Commodus Emperor, his persecution of Samaritans, 169
Conder, Colonel, on the earliest form of the Pentateuch, 207-96
localises the Avites near Nineveh, 21
on Hittite origin of the Semitic script, 211-2
Covenants, the seven which bind the Samaritans, 175
Cowley, Dr, on Mehablah, a Samaritan Satan, 190
Creation, Babylonian story of, 185
the doctrine of, taught by the Samaritans, 181-2
tablets of Nineveh less primitive than those of Genesis, 382
the ten words of, 184-5
Critical theory, higher summary of argument against, 384-6
Cuthah identified by Dr Pinches as Kutu, near Babylon, 21

D

D, symbol for Deuteronomist, 358
D (*daleth*) confused with R (*resh*), 292-4
Daliya, Samaritan High Priest frustrates Ptolemy's attempt to obtain the temple treasures on Mount Gerizim, 163
Dalman, Prof., on the difference between Jewish and Samaritan Passover rites, 141-2
Daltu, a bucket in Hittite, according to Conder origin of *daleth*, 208-12
Daniel, book of, argument for its inclusion in the Canon of O.T., 360, note
Dead, the, buried in coffins by the Samaritans, 140
Death, how met by the Samaritans, 139
Decalogue, the, its authorship, 72-3
special sanctity of, 192
Degeneration, religions of the Canaanites, 64
illustrations of its effect on Israel, 64
Deity, belief in a Supreme, universality of, 84-5
Demonology among the Samaritans, 190
Deportation of conquered peoples by Assyrian, its design, 17-21
bearing of, on the Jewish element in Samaria, 17-20
Deuteronomy, date of, as suggested by the Samaritan Pentateuch, 370-5
authorship, Mosaic, suggested by choice of Mounts Ebal and Gerizim for the ratification of Israel's covenant with JHWH, 6-7
higher critical account of its authorship, 65-6, 361-2
objections to the foregoing, 361-2
sacrifices in local High Places sanctioned in, 66-9
not written to enjoin worship on Mount Zion alone, 69-70
Deutsch on Samaritan version of Pentateuch criticised, 288
De Wette carries the critical hypothesis into Joshua, 358
Diodorus Siculus, Alexander the Great poisoned by Antipater, 163
Dispute between Jews and Samaritans before Ptolemy Philometer described, 32-3
Doctrines common to Jews and Samaritans, and their relation to

variants between the Samaritan and Massoretic scripts, 311-2
Dove, image of a, alleged by Jews to be worshipped by Samaritans, 179, note
Driver, Dr, on Wellhausen theory, criticised, 373-4

E

E document, Ephraimite, 361
uses Elohim, 358
Ebal and Gerizim, why chosen by Moses for ratification of Israel's covenant with JHWH, 13-14
Ebal described, 14
on the stones on which the Law was there engraved, 118
Ehud recognised as judge, 155
Eichhorn's theory as to the seventy-two elders who translated the Septuagint, 321
development of Astruc's hypothesis, 358
Eli and Samuel, tendency to national unity under, 26
caused the schism by usurping the High Priesthood, 154
Eliashib, an old man when Nehemiah came to Jerusalem, grandfather of Manasseh, 364
Elijah's active ministry mainly west of Jordan, 3
sacrifice on Carmel, bearing of on ritual of Northern Israel, 77-8
unless had worshipped in Jerusalem, Jewish honour of him inexplicable, 82
Elijah and Elisha in the Samaritan chronicles, 158
may have worshipped in Jerusalem, 383, note
Elisha assumes a different attitude to Jehoshaphat from what he does to Jehoram, 82
Elohim and JHWH interchanged, 299
Ephraim and Manasseh, Samaritans, their trick, 167
Epiphanius on Samaritan heresies, 43
on Samaritan belief in angels, 187
Esarhaddon, appeal of deported colonists to, considered, 22-3
Eschatology of Samaritans, its resemblance to John's Apocalypse, 196-7
Eternity of God, a Samaritan doctrine, 177
Evans, Sir Arthur, on Minoan script, 215-7, Appendix III., 404-11
Ezekiel and the origin of the so-called Law of Holiness, 362
Ezra, on the illegality of Jewish intermarriage with Samaritans, 118
reason for thinking he was not the author of the Priestly Code, 367-9
terminates friendly relations between Jews and Samaritans, 118-9

F

Fetichism, African, described, 64
Fishing, the letter *tzade* pictograph of a person fishing, 216
Flood, story in Genesis more primitive than the corresponding story in Babylonian records, 382-3
Foreigners resident in Galilee hostile to the Jews, 35
Frankel's theory of a Samaritan interpolation of their Pentateuch from the Septuagint, 329

G

Galilee, history of, under monarchy in Samaria, 3
inhabitants, deported by Tiglath-Pileser, 3
inhabitants, why they escaped persecution by Antiochus Epiphanes, 36
relation of, to Jewish revolt against Antiochus Epiphanes, 35-6
stronghold of Judaism, 36
Garmun connives at circumcision, 42-3
Gaster's, Dr, Samaritan Book of Joshua, 149, 150
Genealogies, antediluvian, explained as given in Samaritan text, 344

Genealogies in the Septuagint, 344, 345
variants in, as formed in the Samaritan Septuagint and Massoretic versions considered, 345-7
Genesis, first chapter, variants between Samaritan and Massoretic texts noted, 280
first five verses, how read by Samaritans, 235
primitive character of ethnological tables there, 382
Gerizim, Mount, described, 6-9
one of the seven things separated from Godhead before all else, 183
how long sacrifices were offered in temple there, 119-20
the true Bethel, 157
treated as God's appointed site for national worship, when was it, 117
on Heavenly Paradise, and earthly Eden, 198
Gesenius, classification of variants between Samaritan and Massoretic texts, 282-305
collection of Samaritan hymns by, 266
on Asaria de Rossi's theory of corruption of the LXX. by Alexandrian Greeks, 328-9
on differences between the Samaritan and Massoretic Pentateuch reviewed and criticised, 305
on grammar accommodated to that of the Samaritan dialect, 239-45
thesis on the Samaritan Pentateuch, 276
Gezer, antiquarian discoveries in, 61-2
Gibbon on Roman Empire under Hadrian and the Antonines, 40
Ginsburg, on variants involving the *matres lectionis*, 326
Glory of the Lord, hypostatised by Marqah, 180
God, glory of, 175, 181
Graetz, on scene at Naioth when Samuel prophesised, 98-9
Guerin, account of Nablus, 8
description of ruins on Ebal and Gerizim, 13, 14

H

Hadrian, Emperor, in Samaritan history, 167-9
erects a temple to Cæsar on Mount Gerizim, 168
Hadrian's original favour to the Samaritans withdrawn, 168
rebukes Jewish High Priest for idolatry, 167
Haupt, P., on our Lord's origin, refuted, 22, note
Hebrew, language spoken in Palestine in time of the Patriarchs, 239-40
greater resemblance to Samaritan than Jewish Aramaic, 258
language spoken both by Samaritans and Jews in time of Haggai and Malachi, 257
Heidenheim on Samaritan hymns, 262
in his collective poem on Unity of God as taught by Samaritans, 180
Hellenic Empire, condition of Samaritans under, 31-2
Heraclius, resultless victories of, 46-7
Hermon, Mount, seen from top of Mount Ebal, 14
Herod, alleged cruelty of, to the Samaritans, 165
generous treatment of the Samaritans, 37-8
Hexateuch, the, how it looks to a reader ignorant of higher critics, 356-8
critical theory of its constitution and origin, 358-63
Hezekiah as Assyrian Viceroy, probability of, 4, 14, 18
his Passover for all Israel, date of, 4, 16
Hierarchies, angelic, not recognised by Samaritans, 188
Higher critical theory, argument against it summarised, 384-6
Historic character of Samaritan religion exhibited, 143-4
History of a people revealed in its language, 236-7
Hittite writing, hieroglyphic nature of, 206

Hizqiah, the Samaritan High Priest and Alexander the Great, 163
Hogarth on the death of Alexander the Great by poison, 163
Hommel on the cuneiform origin of the Samaritan script, 208
Hypothesis, higher critical, its origin and development, 358-9
Hyrcanus, John, conquest of Samaria, 35
Samaritan temple burned by, 141
Samaritanism, alleged conversion to, 141

I

Ibri character, the name given to the Samaritan in the Talmud, 350
regarded as that in which the Law was first given,
Images not used in Samaritan worship, 200
Immortality of the soul, a doctrine of the Samaritans, 187
Intermarriage between Jews and Samaritans forbidden by Ezra and Nehemiah, sketch of this incident, 28-30
criticism of this action, 29-30
Israel, deportation of under Sargon, not universal, 15, 16
Israelite prophets, proof that they were not evolved from the so-called medicine man of the heathen, 84-5
religion, essentially historic character of, 143-4
Israelites, differences between the Northern and Southern tribes considered and explained, 26-7
number of under Joshua, 59
Israelitish disunion under the Judges and its results, 60-1
Itacism, what it proves in regard to a MS., 285

J

J document, Judæan in origin, 361
uses JHWH, 358
Jaddua, did he ever meet with Alexander the Great, 107, note, 112
JE document, not a law-book, 371
Jerome on Samaritan practices and tenets, 43
Jerusalem, fall of, not mentioned in Samaritan history, 166-7
Jewish charges against the Samaritans, 178
sacred history superior to the corresponding Samaritan history, 172
theology compared and contrasted with Samaritan, 199-200
theory of the origin of the Samaritans, 15
Jews, sects of the, referred to by Abu'l Fath, 164
separation of the, from the Samaritan, and the importance of fixing MS. date, 356
Josephus, account of the Samaritan submission to Antiochus Epiphanes, 33-4
bias of, against the Samaritans, 33
on the presence of Israelites in Northern Palestine subsequent to the deportations under Sargon, 16-17
proof of the unreliability of his writings, 366
testimony as to the Essenes, 103
writings of, known to the Samaritans, 164
Joshua, absence of book of, from the Samaritan Recension, its bearing on the higher critical theory of the origin of the Pentateuch, 359-60
book of, assumed to be known by Israelites according to the prophets Amos and Hosea, 96-7
evidence that it was known to Samaritans, 10-11
no part of the Law when the Samaritans got their recension of the Pentateuch, 359
placed by Jews on different plane from the Five Books of Moses, 359-60
reason why it is excluded from Samaritan canon, 97
Joshua, Samaritan book of, described, 146-7, 155-6
resemblance to the Jewish book, 150-1

Joshua, the Jewish leader, honour paid him by the Samaritans, 145
Josiah's religious reformation, its bearing on the Samaritan claims to be of Israelite origin, 16-20
its influence on the Samaritan people, 20-2, 115-7
Judea, kingdom of, described: its pastoral character, 4
Judges, legends restraint in, 378
Justasa, a robber set up as king, 44
Justin II., severe oppression of Samaritans by, 46
Justin Martyr, his connection with Samaria, 40
Justinian's oppression of Samaritans and the rebellion it caused, 45-6
Juynboll, Dr, on Samaritan book of Joshua, 147

K

Kabhodh (Divine Glory), hypostatised by Marqah, 180
Kahle, Dr Paul, on Samaritan Targum, 267, note
Karaites resemble doctrinally the Samaritans, 201
Khosrou Purviz, his conquest of Palestine, 46
many Samaritans crucified by, 46
Kingship, why more powerful in Davidic kingdom, 104-5
Kircheim's classification of variants between the Massoretic and Samaritan texts criticised, 284
Kohn, Dr, classification of the same criticised, 284
on alleged corruption of Septuagint by Alexandrian Greeks, 321
on possible theories to explain the variances between the Samaritan and the Septuagint texts of the Torah, 327
on Samaritan Torah as foundation of Septuagint, 329-35
criticism of the above theory, 335-41

L

Lammens, on assistance given to Saracen conquerors of Palestine, 47
Lampridius on alleged introduction by Heliogabalus of Samaritan rites into the syncretistic-worship of the God whose name he bore, 41
Lang, Andrew, referred to, 64
Law, the book of, discovered in temple, Dr Naville's theory about it, 375-7
was it the whole Torah? 376
an individualised copy of the law, 375
it was recognised to be the book of the law although by hypothesis the Jews had no law-book, 66, 375-6
the whole of it, known to Amos, evidence for, 81-2
historic incidents referred to by Amos and Hosea, 94-5
proof that it dates as far back as Samuel, 381
Leaf, on knowledge of Phœnician alphabet in Crete, 1400 B.C., 233
Levirate law, observation of, by Samaritans, 138
differences between Jewish and Samaritan observances, with reasons for them, 139
Lewis, Mrs, her Palestinian Lectionaries, 166
Lidzbarski, quoted, 224
Lost ten tribes of Israel discussed, 15

M

M (*mem*) and N (*nun*) confused, 294-5
Macalister, Dr, discoveries at Gezer, 61-2, 64
Maccabæan script, examined, 224-5
struggle, the Samaritan immunity during it, 33-4
MacEwen, Prof., on sprinkling of the Paschal lamb's blood on the forehead of children, etc., 132
M'Fayden, Prof., on Ephod and Teraphim, 72-3, note
Madden, *History of Jewish Coinage*, 227

Magic, believed in by the Samaritans, 190
Magus, Simon, claim to be the Paraclete, 195
claim to be the Samaritan Christ, 195
Man, constitution of, as taught in Samaritan theology, 186
Manasseh, the fugitive Jewish High Priest, critical theory about him reviewed, 364
his influence on the text of Samaritan Torah, 325
probable author of the Samaritan doctrine regarding Mount Gerizim as God's appointed seat of national worship, 117-8
reason why he excluded the book of Joshua from the Samaritan Torah, 153-4
Manasseh and his brother Ephraim trick Samaritan worshipper, 167
Mandeville, Sir John, account of the Samaritans in fourteenth century, 51-2, 120
Manir, ben, name given to Samaritan Messiah, 192
Manuscripts, early, how they were written, 285-6
Marqah, the Samaritan theologian, his *Book of Wonders*, 268
date and teaching of, 174
Marriage ceremony, Samaritan and Jewish contrasted, 138
Martyr, Justin, on the Paschal lamb, 131
Marwick, Wm., on Samaritan worship of a dove, 179, note
Massoretic recension of Pentateuch, the importance of determining its relation to the Samaritan, 355
text, reasons for discounting its critical value, 324
was it prior to the Samaritan? 283
Mattura, his hymns referred to, 262
Maundrel, Henry, account of Samaritans in seventeenth century, 53-4
Menahem, estimate of population in his time, 17
Merx, Dr, on Samaritan Christology, 194
poem on the Thaheb, 194, 268
Messiah, Samaritan belief in the, 193
Millennium, the, in Samaritan doctrine, 196-7
Mills, Dr, description of Samaritan synagogue at Nablus, 121
on dress worn by the Samaritans when at worship, 122
on Samaritan creed, 175
on Samaritan disbelief in prayers for the dead, 140
on Samaritan doctrine of the resurrection, 197
on Samaritan right to observe the Passover at a later date when unable to do so at the correct date, 130
Mohammedan influence on Samaritan religion, 192
influence on Samaritan theology, 175-6
Mohammedanism, rise and victorious progress of, 47-8
Monotheism of the Samaritans, 175
Montgomery, Dr, hymn of Samaritans translated, 177
on legal relation between Jews and Samaritans as recognised by Jews, 38
on persecution of Samaritans by Abbaside khalifs, 48
on resistance of Samaritans to Khosrou Purviz, the Persian conqueror of Palestine, 46
on Samaritan Feast of Unleavened Bread, 132
on Samaritan names for angels, 188
on Samaritan names for devils, 189
on story of Garmun and Baba Rabba, 42-3
Morinus and the Samaritan Pentateuch, 275
Morning and evening prayers offered by the Samaritans, 140-1
Mosaism in Northern Israel, its vitality, proof of, 58 ff.
Moses in Samaritan theology almost equivalent to Christ in Christianity, 192-3
the one mediator of a divine revelation, 191
prayer of, a hymn translated, 263-4

Mother roll of Massoretic and Samaritan texts written in angular script, 295-6
Music, its place in prophetic worship of JHWH, 93
no, in Samaritan synagogue worship, 122
Mythology, the theology of childhood, 173

N

Nablus, city and valley of, described, 7-8
roll of Samaritan Pentateuch described, Appendix II., 396-403
Nachman, Moses ben, notice of his visit to Palestine in thirteenth century, 51
recognises likeness of Samaritan to Maccabæan script, 227
Nassau, R. H., referred to and quoted, 64
Naville's theory of the original language of the Old Testament, Appendix IV., 412-24
on the Roll of the Law found in the time of Josiah, 375
Nazirites in Northern Israel, their significance, 81
Nehemiah, date and historic value of, 106-7, note
his termination of friendly relations between Jews and Samaritans, 119
his zeal against Jewish intermarriage with the Samaritans considered and criticised, 29
Neubauer's Samaritan Chronicle, its discovery, 146
review and analysis of, 159
Nicaso, wife of Manasseh and daughter of Sanballat, 29
Nicholls, Samaritan grammar referred to, 253
Nomenclature, significance of Biblical, especially as regards the use of JHWH and Baal in Hebrew proper names, 57-9

O

Objections to the higher critics' views about the origin and development of the Hexateuch stated, 363-4
Omnipresence of God, a Samaritan doctrine, 177-80
Origen, influence of, in modifying the text of the Septuagint, 325
on the resurrection as not taught by Samaritans, 197
on Roman persecution of Samaritans, its reason, 41
Original text of Samaritan Torah, reason for dating it in Ahab's time, 325
Ox, the, was it a symbol of JHWH, 72

P

P, symbol of Priestly Code, 358
Palestine, condition of, in Joshua's day, 60
not fully subdued by Joshua, 60
the three nationalities settled there in Joshua's time, 59-60
Paradigms of verbal forms, 270-4
Parallelism absent from Samaritan poetry, 268
Passover, the, adjustment of it by the Samaritans to the Sabbath, 126
contrast between the Jewish and Samaritan, 130-1
description of a Samaritan, 126-30
feast carefully observed by Samaritans, 124-5
ritual, summary of differences between the Jewish and Samaritan forms, 141-2
Samaritan method of fixing its date, 125-6
Pattie, R. B., explanation of Hezekiah's Great Passover, 16
Pentateuch alone canonical among the Samaritans, 145
complete in all its parts when it reached Samaria, proof, 363
critical theory as to its origin and constitution criticised, 361-3

Pentateuch, portions of it, possibly due to Samuel and the schools of the prophets, 377-8
read through by Samaritans between sunrise and sunset, 376, note
reasons for believing the Samaritans had a complete book before the date of Ezra, 384-5
Samaritans, historical evidence renders probable its existence prior to the date assigned to the Jewish Pentateuch by the critics, 54-6
weakness of the critics' reasons for including the book of Joshua in it, 360-1
Personality of God, a Samaritan doctrine, 176
Petermann, Dr, list of variants between Samaritan and Massoretic texts, 279-82
on blood sprinkling in the Passover ritual, 132
on Samaritan mode of reading Hebrew, 234-5
on the four ruling angels in Samaritan teaching, 189
Philo on the Essene community, 103
Polygamy though permitted unknown among the Samaritans, 138
Population of Palestine in time of Joshua, 59
Prayer offered by Samaritans both morning and evening, 140-1
Priestly Code (so called according to critics) brought to Jerusalem from Babylon by Ezra, 362-3
difficulty of accepting the critics' account of its prompt acceptance at Jerusalem, 367-70
difficulty of P being received in Samaria at the instance of Manasseh, 368-9
evidence for its priority to Deuteronomy, 375
objections to its early date considered and met, 382-4
proof that it must have been known in Samaria before Ezra came to Jerusalem, 370
Priests, why more influential in Southern than Northern Israel, 27, 104
Procopius' account of Samaritan rebellion under Anastasius, 45
on alleged Samaritan conversion to Christianity, 46
Pronunciation of Hebrew letters considered, 231-2
Prophetic and Essene communities compared, their points of resemblance and contrast, 103
denunciation of worship at the High Places, cause of, 65-6
guilds under Elijah and Elisha, 101-2
responsibility for the books of Samuel and Kings in the Canon, 107-8
role in Israelite religion, 144
worship (prophetic) and synagogue worship practically identical, 97
worship included reading of the Law and musical services, 93
worship of JHWH, its form in Northern Israel, 91-3
Prophets alleged to be authors of historical books of the Bible, 105-8
Prophets and priests, relations to one another in Northern and in Southern Israel, 85-9
Prophets, customary badge or mark to distinguish them, 102-3
description of how they occupied their time, 105
in Northern Israel, how far their influence tended to supersede that of the priests, 89-92
in Northern Israel more powerful than in the South, 27, 103
political impotence in Davidic Kingdom, 104
schools of the, described, 97-106
Ptolemæus Lagi deports Samaritans to Egypt, 32
Purim, Feast of, as observed by Samaritans, 136
contrast between the Samaritan and the Jewish observance, 136

Q

Qiblah, the Samaritan, 161
the Israelite, 161
the true decided, 161

R

Rabbin, on the unlawfulness of any translation of the Law out of Hebrew into a foreign tongue, 321
exception in favour of Greek, 322
on the variations the translators introduced, 322
Religion, its relation to ritual, 173-4
Resurrection, Samaritan belief in the doctrine of the, 197
Revelation of God's will, believed in by all nations, 83-4
Samaritan belief in their possession of, through Moses, 191
Rhyme, use of, in Samaritan hymns, 265
Ritual worship in Northern Israel considered and described, 77-81
Rolls, the most ancient form of books, 230
Rougé, Dr, on Semitic script as derived from Egypt, 209-11

S

Sabbath, the, strictly observed by Samaritans, 123
Samaritan adjustment of the Passover to, 126
Sakhra, a Holy Stone of the Samaritans, described, 12
tradition regarding it, 12
Samaria, city and state of, described, 2
considered as an Assyrian Province, its extent and character, 4
historic interest of, 5, 6
present extent and condition of, 7-9, 14
early history of, 25-7
record of its history under the Hasmonæans and Herodians, 34-6
united to Judah under Herod, 37
Samaritan sea-coast occupied by Philistines, 5
Samaritan Aramaic and the Targum in that tongue considered, 246
compared with Hebrew and Chaldee, 246-55
Samaritan Hebrew literature, scantiness of, 260
Samaritan aspect of Israelite religion, independent of and more primitive than that furnished by Judaism, evidence of this, 355
Samaritan burial, method of, described, 139
Samaritan Canon, reason for non-inclusion of literary prophetic prophecies, 110
reason for the non-inclusion of the books of Joshua, Judges, Samuel, and the Kings, 108-10
Samaritan claim to Israelite origin considered, 14-24
claim to Israelite origin shown to be well-founded, 352
Samaritan claim to a share in Jewish temple worship, 23
creed outlined, 174-5
Samaritan disfavour with Romans, evidence of, 41
history of the people, 25 ff.
history as affected by Bar-Cochba, 40-1
history as suggesting the possession of a copy of the whole law by that people in the time of Esarhaddon, 379-80
history as suggesting the existence of the whole law in the time of David and Solomon, 380-1
hymns collected by Gesenius, 174
independence of the Jews, 353-4
independence of the Jews, considered in its bearing and value in regard to the Judaic religion and its sacred books, 25-6
Samaritan letter to Antiochus Epiphanes, 33-4
Samaritan literature in Aramaic and Hebrew very scanty, 260
latest only in Arabic, 260
sacred, destroyed by Hadrian, 168-9
Samaritan Mosaism prior to fall of Northern Kingdom, 352
Samaritan Passover, consequence of difference of date compared with the Jewish, 39
observance and its present site described, 12-13
Samaritan Pentateuchal manuscripts enumerated, Appendix I., 387-95

Samaritan Pentateuchal text, date of divergences from Massoretic, 316-8
Pentateuchal text, was it copied from an MS. in the square character? 289-91
Pentateuchal text, was it a retranslation of the Septuagint, 327-8
Samaritan pronunciation of the Hebrew letters, peculiarity of, 232
rebellion under Zeno and its punishment, 44
recension of Torah, evidence for its antiquity based on the script in which it is written, 355
relations to the Jewish revolt under Nero, 39
ritual like that of the Jewish Sephardim, 121-2
ritual worship before the captivity, proof that it resembled the ritual common in Judea even in post-exilic times, 79-81
Samaritan Sanhedrin, 39
script compared with that of Maccabæan inscriptions, 225-6
script, evolution of, 225-6
script, Jewish allegation that the Law was first given in, 350
Greek version, was there a? 32
sympathy with Romans under Pompey, 37
Targum considered, 261
Torah, original text of, probably as old as the date of Ahab at latest, 325
worship on Gerizim, a replica of Jewish worship on Mount Zion, 30-1
writing, peculiar features of, 228-9
Samaritanism, proof that it is an earlier type of Israel's religion than that established in Judea by Ezra, 200
Samaritans, description of their physical appearance, 24
Samaritans, feast of the New Moon still celebrated by, 123-4
Samaritans, the, flight to Britain alleged, 48
history of, under the Antonines, 41
history of, during the Crusades not recorded, 48
Samaritans, history of, under the Hellenic Empire, 31-6
persecution of, under Hadrian, 41
persecution of, under Christian emperors, 41-2
persecution of, under the Eastern Empire, 43-4
pertinacity of their faith and its independence of the Jews, 46
seek refuge from persecution in Persia, 46
welcome the victorious Saracens, 47
worship now confined to the Nablus synagogue alone, 120
Samaritikon, the, account of, 238
origin of Septuagint alleged from, 330-3
Samuel the prophet, his share in the production of the Pentateuch, 377-8
Samuel and the prophets, editors not authors of Pentateuch, 381-2
Sanballat, Governor of Samaria, 28
father-in-law of Manasseh, 111
his temple on Mount Gerizim and its history, 9-10, 112-3
Sargon, his account of conquest of Samaria and deportation of its inhabitants, 18
Sayce, Dr, on Hittite writing, 206
quoted, 331
Scaliger, Joseph, and the Samaritan book of Joshua, 147
Script, the angular, its development described, 296
Scripts, the oldest known Hebrew, what are they? 291-2
Semitic script, whence derived? 206-10
new theory of its origin, 212-20
Septuagint, the, differences between it, and the Samaritan and Massoretic recensions of the Torah, 323-4
evidence that it was not edited from a Samaritan recension of the Torah, 343, 355
importance of, in Greek-speaking world, 324
its origin considered, 320-4
relation of later Talmudic Judaism to it, 321-2
uncertainty as to its text, 324-5

Septuagint, use of by our Lord and his apostles, Paul and Peter, 321
was it translated from a text which implies a copy of the Torah brought into Egypt by Jeremiah or in his time? 349
witness to the integrity of the Pentateuch at a date antecedent to Ezra, confirmed by the Samaritan text of Torah, 350-1
was there a *Samariticon?* 32
Seven things, the, for which the world was created according to Samaritan teaching, 183
Shechem, Valley of, its historic associations, 5-7
Shema, the, not repeated by the Samaritans, 177
Shobach, story of the defeat and death of, 151-2
Simon the Maccabee, coins of, inscriptions in Samaritan characters, 349
probably High Priest at Alexander's invasion, 365
Simon the Just, not identical with Simon II., 365, note
Sin, original, doctrine of, not known to Samaritans, 187
Smith, Robertson, Professor, quoted, 173
Solomon's ceremony at dedication of temple quite in keeping with the Priestly Code, 381-4
Spirituality of God, a Samaritan doctrine, 177-8
Stafford, Roland G., account of Samaritan Passover, 13
Stähelin and De Wette carry the Astruc hypothesis into Joshua, 358
Stanley, Dean, quoted, 365, note
Stars, the, Samaritan association of angels with, 190
Stones, the twelve, on Mount Gerizim, described, 10
Story of Garmun and Baba Rabba, 42-3
Suetonius referred to, 40
Surdi, Samaritan name of Artaxerxes, 162

T

Tabernacle, the, symbol of national unity in early Israel, 61
Tabernacles, the Feast of, as observed by Samaritans, 136
Talmudic tract *Kuthim* contains dicta regarding the relation of Jews and Samaritans, 38
Targum, the Samaritan, described, 180
Temples, the, to JHWH in Upper and Lower Egypt, a proof that subordinate shrines were allowed in later Jewish history, 67-8
Testimony to a people's religion, what gives it value and reliability, 1
Thaheb, belief in the, 193
coming of the, or Messiah and the end of the world, 172
date of his advent, 196
Theodosian Code, its penalties for Samaritan worship, 44
Thukot (Succoth), Pharaoh had a country house at, 331
Thursday, the luckiest day for a wedding, 138
Tiamat, mother of the gods, split up by Marduk, in Babylonian plan of Arabia, 185
Titus not noticed in Samaritan history, 166
Tobiah the Ammonite, significance of his having a chamber in the temple at Jerusalem, 118
Tolideh, a Samaritan chronicle described, 146
Torah, the, date of alleged bringing of it to Samaria by Manasseh, 111-2
complete, known in Samaria, before the return of Zerubbabel to Jerusalem, proof of this, 117
known to Samaritans before the days of Ezra, 232
sanctity of, in Samaritan belief, 191
Tractarian movement in England, its analogy to Ezra's reforms, 386
Tradition regarding the twelve stones on Mount Gerizim, 10
Transjordanic province, its tenure by Samaritans precarious, 2-3

Transjordanic province, claim to it by Mesha of Moab, 2-3
Tribes, the lost ten, question considered, 14-15
Truth of God, hypostatised by Marqah, 180

U

U V (*vav*) confused with I Y (*yodh*) through mistake of Jewish scribes, 290
Universe, the created, threefold nature of, a point of Samaritan belief, 184
Unleavened Bread, Feast of, observed by Samaritans, 132-3

V

Valle, Pietro della, on Samaritan communities, 52
  secures copies of Samaritan Pentateuch, 275
  on dwellings of Samaritans in Damascus, 52
Value and reliability of any testimony to a people's religion, secret of, 1
Vespasian's treatment of the Samaritans, 38-9, 166
Vilmar, his edition of Abul Fath's Chronicle, 148

W

Warren, Sir C., his account and plan of the ruins at Nablus and Mount Gerizim, 10-12
  on village of Makkada, 132
Weeks, Feast of, or Pentecost, celebrated by Samaritans, 132
  contrast between Jewish and Samaritan modes of celebration, 133
Wellhausen on Ezra as source of the Pentateuch as now received by the Jews, 363
Will, freedom of the, not taught in Samaritan theology, 187
Winckler, Otto, Dr, on the cuneiform character of the first Pentateuchal text, 207-91
Words, the ten, of Creation, described, 184-5
World, the, Samaritan teaching as to what it was created for, 183
Worlds, a succession of, a part of Samaritan creed, 183
Worship on the High Places, described, 70-1
Wreschner, Dr L., on Samaritan tradition, criticised, 201-2
Wright, Dr, on the Empire of the Hittites, 206
Writing, the discovery of, no date can be fixed for, 203

X

Xerxes, alleged by Josephus to have been the monarch whom Nehemiah served as cup-bearer, 30
  reasons against this allegation, 30
Xiphilinus, epitomes of, 40

Y

Year, the New, Feast at, observed by Samaritans, 133
  the New, contrast between Jewish and Samaritan, 133

Z

Zeno, Emperor, Samaritan rebellion under, 44
Zerdusht-Zoroaster called king, 162
Zerubbabel's temple at Jerusalem, claim of the Samaritans to co-operate in building it, 28
  rejection of the claim, 28

PRINTED BY
OLIVER AND BOYD
EDINBURGH

DATE DUE

JUN 12 '91

HIGHSMITH # 45220

225.951
Sa 43t
66806

GENERAL THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
00027048